

On decomposition numbers of the cyclotomic q -Schur algebras

Nobuharu Sawada*

Department of Mathematics
Tokyo University of Science
Noda, Chiba 278-8510, Japan

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ be the cyclotomic q -Schur algebra associated to the Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}$. We construct a certain subalgebra $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$, and show that it is a standardly based algebra in the sense of Du and Rui. $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ has a natural quotient $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$, which turns out to be a cellular algebra. In the case where the modified Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}^\flat$ is defined, $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ coincides with the cyclotomic q -Schur algebra associated to $\mathcal{H}^\flat$. In this paper, we discuss a relationship among the decomposition numbers of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$, $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$. In particular, we show that some important part of the decomposition matrix of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ coincides with a part of the decomposition matrix of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$.

§0 INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the Ariki-Koike algebra over an commutative integral domain R with parameters $q, q^{-1}, Q_1, \dots, Q_r \in R$, associated to the complex reflection group $W_{n,r} = G(r, 1, n)$. In [DJMa] Dipper, James and Mathas introduced the cyclotomic q -Schur algebras $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ with weight poset Λ as a tool for studying the representations of the Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}$. It is an important problem to determine the decomposition matrix of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. In the case where $r = 1$, the cyclotomic q -Schur algebra coincides with the q -Schur algebra of [DJ]. In that case, under the condition that $R = \mathbb{C}$ and q is a root of unity, Varagnolo and Vasserot proved in [VV] the decomposition conjecture due to Leclerc and Thibon [LT], which provides us an algorithm of computing the decomposition matrix in connection with the canonical basis of the level 1 Fock space of type A .

It is an open problem to determine the decomposition matrix for $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ in the case where $r \geq 2$. It is known by [A] (see also [DM]) that the determination of the decomposition matrix of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ is reduced to the case where $r = 1$ if the parameters satisfy the separation condition

(S) $q^{2k}Q_i - Q_j$ are invertible in R for $|k| < n$, $i \neq j$.

In [U], Ugolov constructed the canonical basis of the level r Fock space of type A , and gave an algorithm of computing them. Assume that $R = \mathbb{C}$, and that $Q_i = q^{s_i}$ with $s_{i+1} - s_i \geq n$ for a root of unity $q \in \mathbb{C}$. In that case, Yvonne [Y] formulated

*The author expresses gratitude to Professor Toshiaki Shoji.

a conjecture which makes it possible to determine the decomposition matrix of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ by means of the algorithm of Ugolov as in the case of $r = 1$. He showed in [Y] that the Jantzen sum formula for $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ also holds for the Fock space side in an appropriate sense, which supports the conjecture.

In this paper, we introduce a certain subalgebra $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$, motivated in [SawS], and show that $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ is a standardly based algebra in the sense of Du and Rui [DR1]. $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ has a natural quotient $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$, which turns out to be a cellular algebra. We discuss a relationship among the representations of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$, $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$. In particular we show, in the case where R is a field, that a certain important part of the decomposition matrix of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ coincides with a part of the decomposition matrix of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$. This reduces a computation of some decomposition numbers of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ to that of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ which seems to have a simpler structure than $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$.

The modified Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}^b$ over R was discussed in [SawS], which has the same parameter set as $\mathcal{H}$, but under the condition that

(*) $Q_i - Q_j$ are invertible in R for any $i \neq j$.

Note that the condition (*) is weaker than the separation condition (S). It is known in [S] that $\mathcal{H}^b$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}$ when R is a field, and the parameters satisfies the separation condition. Let $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_r)$ be a tuple of non-negative integers, and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}(\mathbf{m})$ the set of all r -compositions $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)})$ such that $\lambda^{(i)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{m_i}$. A representation of $\mathcal{H}^b$ on a tensor space $V^{\otimes n}$ was constructed in [S], where $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r V_i$ and V_i is a free R -module of rank m_i satisfying the condition that

(**) $m_i \geq n$ for all i .

In [SawS] we have defined the cyclotomic q -Schur algebra $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ with the poset $\Lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$ as the endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\mathcal{H}^b} V^{\otimes n}$. Moreover, we have constructed a certain subalgebra $\mathcal{S}^0(\mathbf{m}, n)^b$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ which has a surjective algebra homomorphism $\hat{f} : \mathcal{S}^0(\mathbf{m}, n)^b \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$. Note that $\mathcal{S}^0(\mathbf{m}, n)^b$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$) coincides with the previous $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ (resp. $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$) whenever the conditions (*) and (**) are satisfied.

By a result of [SawS], the decomposition matrix of $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ can be described in terms of the decomposition matrices for q -Schur algebras, which are computable by the theorem of Varagnolo-Vasserot. Thus our results determine a part of the decomposition matrix for $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ in the case where $R = \mathbb{C}$ and the parameters $Q_i = q^{s_i}$ are all distinct for a root of unity $q \in \mathbb{C}$.

The details of the paper are as follows. In Section 1 we recall the notations and basic results on the representation theory of the Ariki-Koike algebras and the cyclotomic q -Schur algebras. In Section 2 we investigate the subalgebra $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. We show that $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ is a standardly based algebra in the sense of Du and Rui [DR1], which is a natural extension of the cellular algebra. Section 3 discusses the relationship between $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$, and their Weyl modules $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ and W^λ for a multipartition (or r -partition) λ in Λ , respectively. More precisely, we show that $Z^{(\lambda,0)} \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \simeq W^\lambda$. Even though $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ is not cellular, the Weyl module $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ has the radical and we can discuss almost similar to the cellular theory, i.e., we can define irreducible modules L_0^λ of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ in a similar way as defining of irreducible modules L^λ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. In turn, in Section 4 we study the relationship between $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ (or $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$) and $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and their Weyl modules. For a multipartition $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let $\overline{Z}^\lambda$ be the

Weyl module of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ is a cellular algebra, we can also define irreducible modules $\overline{L}^\lambda$. Because $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ is a quotient of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ by $\mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$, we can regard $\overline{Z}^\lambda$ and $\overline{L}^\lambda$ as $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -modules. Under this setting, we can verify that the decomposition number $[\overline{Z}^\lambda : \overline{L}^\mu]$ is equal to the decomposition number $[Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu]$ for any multipartitions λ, μ in Λ when R is a field. In section 5, we estimate the decomposition number $[W^\lambda : Z^\mu]$ by working use of the induction of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ and the restriction of W^λ . Suppose that R is a field. Our main result asserts that $[\overline{Z}^\lambda : \overline{L}^\mu] = [Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu] = [W^\lambda : L^\mu]$ for all multipartitions λ, μ in Λ such that $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)})$, $\mu = (\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(r)})$ with $|\lambda^{(i)}| = |\mu^{(i)}|$. Finally, we denote by $[W^{\lambda^{(i)}} : L^{\mu^{(i)}}]$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$) the decomposition number of $L^{\mu^{(i)}}$ in $W^{\lambda^{(i)}}$. Again suppose that R is a field. Moreover, assume that $\Lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}(\mathbf{m})$ and the previous conditions $(*)$, $(**)$. Then, as a corollary, we have that $[W^\lambda : L^\mu] = \prod_{i=1}^r [W^{\lambda^{(i)}} : L^{\mu^{(i)}}]$ for all multipartitions λ, μ in $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}(\mathbf{m})$ as above.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 0. Introduction
- 1. Preliminaries on Ariki-Koike algebras and cyclotomic q -Schur algebras
- 2. The standard basis for $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$
- 3. A relationship between $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$
- 4. A relationship between $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ and $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$
- 5. An estimate for decomposition numbers

§1 PRELIMINARIES ON ARIKI-KOIKE ALGEBRAS AND CYCLOTOMIC q -SCHUR ALGEBRAS

1.1. Fix positive integers r and n and let $\mathfrak{S}_n$ be the symmetric group of degree n . Let R be an integral domain with 1 and $q, Q_1, \dots, Q_r$ be elements in R , with invertible q . The Ariki-Koike algebra associated to the complex reflection group $W_{n,r} = G(r, 1, n)$, is the associative unital algebra $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{n,r}$ over R with generators $T_1, \dots, T_n$ subject to the following conditions,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (T_1 - Q_1) \cdots (T_1 - Q_r) &= 0, \\
 (T_i - q)(T_i + q^{-1}) &= 0 & (i \geq 2), \\
 T_1 T_2 T_1 T_2 &= T_2 T_1 T_2 T_1, \\
 T_i T_j &= T_j T_i & (|i - j| \geq 2), \\
 T_i T_{i+1} T_i &= T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1} & (2 \leq i \leq n-1).
 \end{aligned}$$

It is known that $\mathcal{H}$ is a free R -module of rank $n!r^n$. The subalgebra $\mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ of $\mathcal{H}$ generated by $T_2, \dots, T_n$ is isomorphic to the Iwahori-Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n$ of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$.

For $i = 2, \dots, n$ let s_i be the transposition $(i-1, i)$ in $\mathfrak{S}_n$. Then $\{s_2, \dots, s_n\}$ generate $\mathfrak{S}_n$. For $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, we set $T_w = T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_k}$ where $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k}$ is a reduced expression. Then T_w is independent of the choice of a reduced expression. We also put $L_k = T_k \cdots T_2 T_1 T_2 \cdots T_k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Note that all $L_1, \dots, L_n$ commutes. Moreover, these elements produce a basis of $\mathcal{H}$.

Theorem 1.2 ([AK, Theorem 3.10]). *The Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}$ is free as an R -module with basis $\{L_1^{a_1} \cdots L_n^{a_n} T_w \mid w \in \mathfrak{S}_n, 0 \leq a_i < r \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.*

Recall that a composition of n is sequence $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$ of non-negative integers such that $|\sigma| = \sum_i \sigma_i = n$. σ is a partition if in addition $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots$. If $\sigma_i = 0$ for all $i > k$ then we write $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$.

An r -composition (or multicomposition) of n is an r -tuple $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)})$ of compositions with $\lambda^{(i)} = (\lambda_1^{(i)}, \lambda_2^{(i)}, \dots)$ such that $|\lambda^{(1)}| + \dots + |\lambda^{(r)}| = n$. An r -composition λ is an r -partition if each $\lambda^{(i)}$ is a partition. If λ is an r -partition of n then we write $\lambda \vdash n$. The diagram $[\lambda]$ of the r -composition λ is the set $[\lambda] = \{(i, j, s) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \lambda_j^{(s)}, 1 \leq s \leq r\}$. The elements of $[\lambda]$ are called nodes. The set of r -compositions of n is partially ordered by dominance, i.e, if λ and μ are two r -compositions then λ dominates μ , and we write $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, if

$$\sum_{c=1}^{s-1} |\lambda^{(c)}| + \sum_{j=1}^i |\lambda_j^{(s)}| \geq \sum_{c=1}^{s-1} |\mu^{(c)}| + \sum_{j=1}^i |\mu_j^{(s)}|$$

for $1 \leq s \leq r$ and for all $i \geq 1$. If $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ and $\lambda \neq \mu$ then we write $\lambda \triangleright \mu$.

If λ is an r -composition let $\mathfrak{S}_\lambda = \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda^{(1)}} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda^{(r)}}$ be the corresponding Young subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_n$. Set

$$x_\lambda = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\lambda} q^{l(w)} T_w, \quad u_\lambda^+ = \prod_{s=2}^r \prod_{k=1}^{a_s} (L_k - Q_s),$$

where $a_s = |\lambda^{(1)}| + \dots + |\lambda^{(s-1)}|$ for $2 \leq s \leq r$. If $s = 1$ then we set $a_s = 0$. Set $m_\lambda = x_\lambda u_\lambda^+ = u_\lambda^+ x_\lambda$ and define M^λ to be the right ideal $M^\lambda = m_\lambda \mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{H}$.

For any r -composition μ , a μ -tableau $\mathbf{t} = (\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{t}^{(r)})$ is a bijection $t : [\mu] \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, where $\mathbf{t}^{(i)}$ is a tableau of $\text{Shape}(\mathbf{t}^{(i)}) = \mu^{(i)}$. We write $\text{Shape}(\mathbf{t}) = \mu$ if $\mathbf{t}$ is a μ -tableau. A μ -tableau $\mathbf{t}$ is called standard (resp. row standard) if all $\mathbf{t}^{(i)}$ are standard (resp. row standard). Let $\text{Std}(\lambda)$ be the set of standard λ -tableaux.

For each r -composition μ , let $\mathbf{t}^\mu$ be the μ -tableau with the numbers $1, 2, \dots, n$ attached in order from left to right along its rows and from top to bottom, and from $\mu^{(1)}$ to $\mu^{(r)}$. If $\mathbf{t}$ is any row standard μ -tableau let $d(\mathbf{t}) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ be the unique permutation such that $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}^\mu d(\mathbf{t})$. Furthermore, let $*$: $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be the anti-isomorphism given by $T_i^* = T_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and set $m_{\mathbf{st}} = T_{d(\mathbf{s})}^* m_\lambda T_{d(\mathbf{t})}$.

Theorem 1.3 ([DJMa, Theorem 3.26; Murphy bases]). *The Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}$ is free as an R -module with cellular basis $\{m_{\mathbf{st}} \mid \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \vdash n\}$.*

Here, and below, whenever we write expressions involving a pair of tableaux (such as $m_{\mathbf{st}}$ or φ_{ST} and so on), we implicitly assume that the two tableaux are of the same shape.

1.4. For each r -partition λ let $\mathcal{H}^\lambda$ be the R -submodule of $\mathcal{H}$ with basis $\{m_{\mathbf{ub}} \mid \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b} \in \text{Std}(\mu) \text{ for some } \mu \triangleright \lambda\}$. Then $\mathcal{H}^\lambda$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let S^λ be the Specht module (or cell module) corresponding to the r -partition λ . Thus, $S^\lambda = (m_\lambda + \mathcal{H}^\lambda) \mathcal{H}$, a submodule of $\mathcal{H} / \mathcal{H}^\lambda$. For each $\mathbf{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ let $m_{\mathbf{t}} = m_{\mathbf{t}^\lambda} + \mathcal{H}^\lambda$. Then S^λ is free as an R -module with basis $\{m_{\mathbf{t}} \mid \mathbf{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)\}$.

Furthermore, there is an associative symmetric bilinear form on S^λ which is determined by

$$m_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \mathfrak{s}} m_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda} \equiv \langle m_{\mathfrak{s}}, m_{\mathfrak{t}} \rangle m_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \mathfrak{t}^\lambda} \pmod{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}$$

for all $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$. The radical $\text{rad} S^\lambda$ of this form is again an $\mathcal{H}$ -module, so $D^\lambda = S^\lambda / \text{rad} S^\lambda$ is an $\mathcal{H}$ -module. When R is a field, D^λ is either 0 or absolutely irreducible and all the simple $\mathcal{H}$ -modules up to isomorphisms arise uniquely in this way.

We can now give a definition of the cyclotomic q -Schur algebras. A set Λ of r -compositions of n is saturated if Λ is finite and whenever λ is an r -partition such that $\lambda \geq \mu$ for some $\mu \in \Lambda$ then $\lambda \in \Lambda$. If Λ is a saturated set of r -compositions, we denote by Λ^+ be the set of r -partitions in Λ .

Definition 1.5. Suppose that Λ is a saturated set of multicompositions of n . The cyclotomic q -Schur algebra with weight poset Λ is the endomorphism algebra

$$\mathcal{S}(\Lambda) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{H}}(M(\Lambda)), \quad \text{where } M(\Lambda) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} M^\lambda.$$

Let λ be an r -partition and μ an r -composition. A λ -Tableau of type μ is a map $T : [\lambda] \rightarrow \{(i, s) \mid i \geq 1, 1 \leq s \leq r\}$ such that $\mu_i^{(s)} = \#\{x \in [\lambda] \mid T(x) = (i, s)\}$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $1 \leq s \leq r$. We regard T as an r -tuple $T = (T^{(1)}, \dots, T^{(r)})$, where $T^{(s)}$ is the $\lambda^{(s)}$ -tableau with $T^{(s)}(i, j) = T(i, j, s)$ for all $(i, j, s) \in [\lambda]$. In this way we identify the standard tableaux above with the Tableaux of type $w = ((0), \dots, (1^n))$. If T is a Tableau of type μ then we write $\text{Type}(T) = \mu$.

Given two pairs (i, s) and (j, t) write $(i, s) \preceq (j, t)$ if either $s < t$, or $s = t$ and $i \leq j$.

Definition 1.6. A Tableau T is (row) semistandard if, for $1 \leq t \leq r$, the entries in $T^{(t)}$ are

- (i) weakly increasing along the rows with respect to $\preceq$,
- (ii) strictly increasing down columns,
- (iii) (i, s) appears in $T^{(t)}$ only if $s \geq t$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$ be the set of semistandard λ -Tableaux of type μ and let $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_0^\Lambda(\lambda) = \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$.

Notice that if $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$ is non-empty, then $\lambda \geq \mu$.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{t}$ is a standard λ -tableau and let μ be an r -composition. Let $\mu(\mathfrak{t})$ be the Tableau obtained from $\mathfrak{t}$ by replacing each entry j with (i, k) if j appears in row i of $(\mathfrak{t}^\mu)^{(k)}$. The tableau $\mu(\mathfrak{t})$ is a λ -Tableau of type μ . It is not necessarily semistandard.

If S and T are semistandard λ -Tableaux of type μ and ν respectively, let

$$m_{ST} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S, \nu(\mathfrak{t}) = T}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}.$$

For S and T as above we define a map φ_{ST} on $M(\Lambda)$ by $\varphi_{ST}(m_\alpha h) = \delta_{\alpha\nu} m_{ST} h$, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $\alpha \in \Lambda$. Here $\delta_{\alpha\nu}$ is the Kronecker delta, i.e, $\delta_{\alpha\nu} = 1$ if $\alpha = \nu$ and it is zero otherwise. Then φ_{ST} is well-defined, and it belongs to $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Moreover,

Theorem 1.7 ([DJMa, Theorem 6.6]). The cyclotomic q -Schur algebra $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ is free as an R -module with cellular basis $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda) = \{\varphi_{ST} \mid S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^\Lambda(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \Lambda^+\}$.

The basis $\{\varphi_{ST}\}$ is called a semistandard basis of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Since this basis is cellular, the map $*$: $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ which is determined by $\varphi_{ST}^* = \varphi_{TS}$ is an anti-automorphism of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. This involution is closely related to the $*$ -involution on $\mathcal{H}$. Explicitly, if $\varphi : M^\nu \rightarrow M^\mu$ is an $\mathcal{H}$ -module homomorphism then $\varphi^* : M^\mu \rightarrow M^\nu$ is the homomorphism given by $\varphi^*(m_\mu h) = (\varphi(m_\nu))^* h$, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$.

For each r -partition $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we define $\mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda} = \mathcal{S}^\vee(\Lambda)^\lambda$ as the R -span of φ_{ST} such that $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^\Lambda(\alpha)$ with $\alpha \triangleright \lambda$, which is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. We define the Weyl module W^λ by the right $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ -submodule of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)/\mathcal{S}^\vee(\Lambda)^\lambda$ generated by the image $\varphi_\lambda = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \in \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ where $T^\lambda = \lambda(\mathbf{t}^\lambda)$. For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^\Lambda(\lambda)$, let φ_T be the image of $\varphi_{T^\lambda T}$ in W^λ . Then the Weyl module W^λ is R -free with basis $\{\varphi_T \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_0^\Lambda(\lambda)\}$. As in the case of Specht modules there is an inner product on W^λ which is determined by

$$\varphi_{T^\lambda S} \varphi_{TT^\lambda} \equiv \langle \varphi_S, \varphi_T \rangle \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \pmod{\mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}}.$$

Let $\text{rad}W^\lambda = \{x \in W^\lambda \mid \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } y \in W^\lambda\}$. The quotient module $L^\lambda = W^\lambda / \text{rad}W^\lambda$ is absolutely irreducible and $\{L^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^+\}$ is a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ -modules.

1.8. For an r -composition μ , we define the type $\alpha = \alpha(\mu)$ of μ by $\alpha = (n_1, \dots, n_r)$ with $n_i = |\mu^{(i)}|$, and the size of μ by $n = \sum_{i=1}^r n_i$. We also define a sequence $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(\mu) = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$. (Recall that $a_i = \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} |\mu^{(k)}| = \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} n_k$.)

We define a partial order $\geq$ on the set $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r$ by $\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{a}'$ for $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$, $\mathbf{a}' = (a'_1, \dots, a'_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r$ if $a_i \geq a'_i$ for any i . We write $\mathbf{a} > \mathbf{a}'$ if $\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{a}'$ and $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{a}'$. It is clear that

$$(1.1) \quad \text{If } \lambda \triangleright \mu, \text{ then } \mathbf{a}(\lambda) \geq \mathbf{a}(\mu) \text{ for } r\text{-compositions } \lambda, \mu.$$

Hence if $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$ is non-empty, then $\lambda \triangleright \mu$, and so we have $\mathbf{a}(\lambda) \geq \mathbf{a}(\mu)$.

For any r -partition λ and r -composition μ , we define a subset $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ of $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$ by

$$\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu) = \{S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) \mid \mathbf{a}(\lambda) = \mathbf{a}(\mu)\}.$$

Note that the condition $\mathbf{a}(\lambda) = \mathbf{a}(\mu)$ is equivalent to $\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$. Take $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$. Then one can check that $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ if and only if each entry of $S^{(k)}$ is of the form (i, k) for some i . Hence in this case $S^{(k)}$ can be identified with a semistandard $\lambda^{(k)}$ -Tableau of type $\mu^{(k)}$ under the usual definition of the semistandard Tableaux for 1-partitions $\lambda^{(k)}$ and 1-compositions $\mu^{(k)}$. It follows that we have a bijection

$$\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu) \simeq \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda^{(1)}, \mu^{(1)}) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda^{(r)}, \mu^{(r)})$$

via $S \leftrightarrow (S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(r)})$. Moreover, if $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ is such that $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S$ with $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$, then the entries of i -th component of $\mathfrak{s}$ consist of numbers $a_i + 1, \dots, a_{i+1}$ for $\mathbf{a}(\lambda) = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$. In particular, $d(\mathfrak{s}) \in \mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ for $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda)$.

Fix an r -tuple $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_r)$ of non-negative integers. Then, an r -composition $\mu = (\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(r)})$ with $\mu^{(i)} = (\mu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \mu_{m_i}^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{m_i}$ is called an $(r, \mathbf{m})$ -composition, and $(r, \mathbf{m})$ -partition is defined similarly. We denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}(\mathbf{m})$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{n,r} = \mathcal{P}_{n,r}(\mathbf{m})$) the set of $(r, \mathbf{m})$ -compositions (resp. $(r, \mathbf{m})$ -partitions) of size n . (Note that $\mathcal{P}_{n,r}(\mathbf{m})$ are naturally identified with each other for any $\mathbf{m}$ such that $m_i \geq n$.)

However, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$ depends on the choice of $\mathbf{m}$.) Finally, let

$$\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda) = \bigcup_{\mu, \nu \in \Lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda^+} \{ \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda) \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu), T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu), \\ \mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\mu) \text{ if } \alpha(\mu) \neq \alpha(\nu) \}$$

and we define $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ as the R -submodule of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ with basis $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$.

§2 THE STANDARD BASIS FOR $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$

2.1. In [SawS], the R -submodule $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ was constructed as an R -subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ when $\Lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$ subject to the conditions $(*)$, $(**)$ in Introduction. But, as a fact, $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ becomes an R -subalgebra with no condition and it become a standardly based algebra in the sense of [DR1] which is an extension of the cellular algebra. The standardly based algebra has a basis, namely standard basis, corresponding to the cellular basis in the case of the cellular algebra. The aim of this section is to prove that $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ is an R -subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ is a standard basis for $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$.

First, we recall the definition of standardly based algebras in [DR1].

Definition 2.2 ([DR1]). *Assume that R is a commutative ring with 1. Let A be an R -algebra and $(\Lambda, \geq)$ a poset. A is called a standardly based algebra on Λ (or standardly based) if the following conditions hold.*

(a) *For any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, there are index sets $I(\lambda), J(\lambda)$ and subsets*

$$\mathcal{A}^\lambda = \{a_{i,j}^\lambda \mid (i,j) \in I(\lambda) \times J(\lambda)\}$$

of A such that the union $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{A}^\lambda$ is disjoint and forms an R -basis for A .

(b) *For any $a \in A$, $a_{i,j}^\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$, we have*

$$a \cdot a_{i,j}^\lambda \equiv \sum_{i' \in I(\lambda)} f_{i',\lambda}(a, i) a_{i',j}^\lambda \pmod{A(>\lambda)} \\ a_{i,j}^\lambda \cdot a \equiv \sum_{j' \in J(\lambda)} f_{\lambda,j'}(j, a) a_{i,j'}^\lambda \pmod{A(>\lambda)},$$

where $A(>\lambda)$ is the R -submodule of A spanned by $\mathcal{A}^\mu$ with $\mu > \lambda$, and $f_{i',\lambda}(a, i)$, $f_{\lambda,j'}(j, a) \in R$ are independent of j and i , respectively. Such a basis $\mathcal{A}$ is called a standard basis for the algebra A .

Note that the cellular algebra is a special case of the standardly based algebras. We prepare some notation.

Let

$$\Omega = (\Lambda^+ \times \{0, 1\}) \setminus \{(\lambda, 1) \mid \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) = \emptyset \text{ for any } \mu \in \Lambda \text{ such that } \mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\mu)\}$$

and we define a partial order $(\lambda_1, \varepsilon_1) \geq (\lambda_2, \varepsilon_2)$ on Ω by $(\lambda_1, \varepsilon_1) > (\lambda_2, \varepsilon_2)$ if $\lambda_1 \triangleright \lambda_2$, or $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ and $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_2$. For a $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega$, we define index sets $I(\lambda, \varepsilon)$, $J(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ by

$$I(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) & \text{if } \varepsilon = 0, \\ \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda, \mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\mu)} \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$J(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) & \text{if } \varepsilon = 0, \\ \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda) & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) = \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$. Then $I(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ and $J(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ are not empty for all $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega$. Assume that $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega$. We define a subset $\mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ by

$$\mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \{\varphi_{ST} \mid (S, T) \in I(\lambda, \varepsilon) \times J(\lambda, \varepsilon)\}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$(2.1) \quad \text{the union } \bigcup_{(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega} \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, \varepsilon) \text{ is disjoint and is equal to the set } \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda).$$

First, we need the following Lemma.

Lemma 2.3 ([M2]). *Suppose that $\lambda_i \in \Lambda^+$ and $\mu_i, \nu_i \in \Lambda$ ($i = 1, 2$). Assume that $\varphi_{S_1 T_1}, \varphi_{S_2 T_2} \in \mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$ where $S_i \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda_i, \mu_i)$, $T_i \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda_i, \nu_i)$. Then*

$$\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2} = \delta_{\nu_1 \mu_2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \Lambda^+, \lambda \geq \lambda_1 \text{ and } \lambda_2, \\ S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_1), T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu_2)}} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}$$

where $r_{ST} \in R$, and $\delta_{\nu_1 \mu_2}$ is such that $\delta_{\nu_1 \mu_2} = 1$ if $\nu_1 = \mu_2$ and it is zero otherwise.

Proof. This lemma was shown by Mathas [M2, (2.8)]. However, since this fact itself is important for later discussions, we give the proof here.

It is sufficient to consider the case where $\nu_1 = \mu_2$. For all $\mu \in \Lambda$, by definition of φ_{ST} , we may suppose that $\varphi_{S_2 T_2}(m_\mu) = \delta_{\mu \nu_2} m_{S_2 T_2} = \delta_{\mu \nu_2} m_{\mu_2} h$ with some $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $m_{S_i T_i} \in M^{\nu_i *} \cap M^{\mu_i}$ ($i = 1, 2$), we have $(\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2})(m_\mu) = \delta_{\mu \nu_2} m_{S_1 T_1} h \in M^{\nu_2 *} \cap M^{\mu_1}$. By [DJMa, Proposition 6.3], we deduce that

$$m_{S_1 T_1} h = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \Lambda^+, \\ S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_1), T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu_2)}} r_{ST} \cdot m_{ST}$$

where $r_{ST} \in R$. Therefore,

$$\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2} = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \Lambda^+, \\ S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_1), T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu_2)}} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}.$$

Note that the set $\{\varphi_{ST}\}$ is the cellular basis for $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ by [DJMa, Theorem 6.6]. Then by the property of cellular basis, the last sum is over $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ with $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_1$ and $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_2$, $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_1)$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu_2)$. This proves the lemma. $\square$

For all $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ with $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu), \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu) \neq \emptyset$ and every $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)$, since definitions of φ_{ST} and m_{ST} we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{ST^\lambda} \varphi_{T^\lambda T})(m_{\mu'}) &= \delta_{\mu'\nu} \cdot \varphi_{ST^\lambda}(m_{T^\lambda T}) = \delta_{\mu'\nu} \cdot \varphi_{ST^\lambda}(m_\lambda) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \nu(\mathfrak{t})=T}} T_{d(\mathfrak{t})} \\ &= \delta_{\mu'\nu} \cdot m_{ST^\lambda} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \nu(\mathfrak{t})=T}} T_{d(\mathfrak{t})} = \delta_{\mu'\nu} \cdot m_{ST} \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu' \in \Lambda$. Therefore,

$$(2.2) \quad \varphi_{ST^\lambda} \varphi_{T^\lambda T} = \varphi_{ST} \quad (\text{for } \forall S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu), \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)).$$

The next lemma is a sharper version of Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that $\lambda_i \in \Lambda^+$ and $\mu_i, \nu_i \in \Lambda$ ($i = 1, 2$), and let $\nu_1 = \mu_2$. Assume that $\varphi_{S_1 T_1}, \varphi_{S_2 T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ where $S_i \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda_i, \mu_i)$, $T_i \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda_i, \nu_i)$. Then*

$$\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2} = \begin{cases} \sum_{\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_1, 0)} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST} + \sum_{\lambda \supseteq \lambda_1} \sum_{\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda)} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}, & \text{if } \varphi_{S_1 T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_1, 0), \\ \sum_{\lambda \supseteq \lambda_1} \sum_{\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}, & \text{if } \varphi_{S_1 T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_1, 1), \\ \sum_{\lambda \supseteq \lambda_2} \sum_{\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda)} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}, & \text{if } \varphi_{S_2 T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_2, 0), \\ \sum_{\lambda \supseteq \lambda_2} \sum_{\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}, & \text{if } \varphi_{S_2 T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_2, 1), \end{cases}$$

where $r_{ST} \in R$ and $\mathcal{C}^0(\lambda) = \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0) \cup \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$ and all λ, S, T occurring in the above formulas are such that $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, and the semistandard Tableaux S, T with $\text{Type}(S) = \mu_1$ and $\text{Type}(T) = \nu_2$, respectively.

Hence the $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2}$ is a linear combination of φ_{ST} , where $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_1)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu_2)$ with $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_1$ and λ_2 .

First assume that $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_1, 0)$. Then for the above φ_{ST} , we have $\mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\mu)$ if $\alpha(\mu) \neq \alpha(\nu_2)$ since $\varphi_{S_2 T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_2$ (Note that $\mu \supseteq \nu \Rightarrow \mathbf{a}(\mu) \geq \mathbf{a}(\nu)$ for $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$. cf. (1.1)). So $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$, hence $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0) \cup \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$. Moreover, the case $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_1, 1)$ cannot happen. In fact, if it happens, then $\alpha(\lambda_1) \neq \alpha(\mu_1)$ which contradicts our assumption that $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_1, 0)$. Therefore, the first equality holds.

The second equality is easy. In fact, assume that $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_1, 1)$. Then φ_{ST} , as in the previous case, are elements in the $\mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$ since $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_1$ and $\mathbf{a}(\lambda_1) > \mathbf{a}(\mu_1)$. Hence we obtain the second one.

Next assume that $\varphi_{S_2T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_2, 0)$. If $\alpha(\mu_1) \neq \alpha(\nu_2)$, then the definition of $\mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_2, 0)$ and our assumption $\mu_2 = \nu_1$ implies that $\alpha(\mu_1) \neq \alpha(\nu_1)$. It follows that $\mathbf{a}(\lambda_1) > \mathbf{a}(\mu_1)$ since $\varphi_{S_1T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$. Thus we have $\mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\mu_1)$ by $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_1$. This shows that φ_{ST} is in $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$. Therefore $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0) \cup \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$ and the third equality holds.

Finally, suppose that $\varphi_{S_2T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_2, 1)$. If $\alpha(\mu_1) = \alpha(\nu_1)$ then $\mathbf{a}(\lambda_2) > \mathbf{a}(\mu_1)$ since $\varphi_{S_2T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_2, 1)$ and $\mu_2 = \nu_1$ by our assumption. Hence $\mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\mu_1)$, since $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_2$. On the other hand, if $\alpha(\mu_1) \neq \alpha(\nu_1)$ then also $\mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\mu_1)$ and $\varphi_{S_1T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\lambda \supseteq \lambda_1$. This argument means that $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$ and hence the fourth equality holds. The lemma is proved. $\square$

2.5. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$. We define $\varphi_\mu \in \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ as the identity map on M^μ and zero map on M^κ with $\kappa \neq \mu$. Moreover, let $1_{\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)}$ be the identity element of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Then, from the definition, we can write $1_{\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)} = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda} \varphi_\mu$. On the other hand, since $\varphi_\mu(m_\mu) = m_\mu \in M^{\mu*} \cap M^\mu$, we have

$$\varphi_\mu(m_\mu) = \sum_{\substack{S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) \\ \lambda \in \Lambda^+}} r_{S, T} \cdot m_{ST} \quad (r_{S, T} \in R)$$

by [DJMa, Proposition 6.3]. This shows that

$$(2.3) \quad \varphi_\mu = \sum_{\substack{S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) \\ \lambda \in \Lambda^+}} r_{S, T} \cdot \varphi_{ST} \quad (\text{for any } \mu \in \Lambda).$$

Thus all the φ_{ST} in the right hand side are contained in $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$. Hence we have

$$(2.4) \quad 1_{\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)} = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda} \sum_{\substack{S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) \\ \lambda \in \Lambda^+}} r_{S, T} \cdot \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda).$$

For any $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega$, we define by $\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, \varepsilon)} = \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)(> (\lambda, \varepsilon))$ the R -submodule of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ spanned by φ_{UV} where $(U, V) \in I(\lambda', \varepsilon') \times J(\lambda', \varepsilon')$ for some $(\lambda', \varepsilon') \in \Omega$ with $(\lambda', \varepsilon') > (\lambda, \varepsilon)$. Note that $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee \lambda} = \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 1)}$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Similarly, we define $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)(\geq (\lambda, \varepsilon))$ as the R -submodule spanned by φ_{UV} with $(\lambda', \varepsilon') \geq (\lambda, \varepsilon)$.

We can now state.

Theorem 2.6. *The subalgebra $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ is standardly based on $(\Omega, \geq)$ with standard basis $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$, that is,*

- (i) *The union $\bigcup_{(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega} \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, \varepsilon) = \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ is disjoint and forms an R -basis for $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$.*
- (ii) *For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$, $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, \varepsilon)$, we have*

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi \cdot \varphi_{ST} &\equiv \sum_{S' \in I(\lambda, \varepsilon)} f_{S', (\lambda, \varepsilon)}(\varphi, S) \cdot \varphi_{S'T} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, \varepsilon)}} \\ \varphi_{ST} \cdot \varphi &\equiv \sum_{T' \in J(\lambda, \varepsilon)} f_{(\lambda, \varepsilon), T'}(T, \varphi) \cdot \varphi_{ST'} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, \varepsilon)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi_{S'T}, \varphi_{ST'} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ and $f_{S',(\lambda,\varepsilon)}(\varphi, S), f_{(\lambda,\varepsilon),T'}(T, \varphi) \in R$ are independent of T and S , respectively.

Proof. The first condition (i) is immediate from (2.1). We show (ii). Take $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$. Note that φ_{ST} is an element in $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$ which is the cellular basis for $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ and φ is an element in $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Hence, by the property of cellular basis, $\varphi_{ST} \cdot \varphi$ can be written as

$$\varphi_{ST} \cdot \varphi = \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda)} r_{T'} \cdot \varphi_{ST'} + \sum_{\substack{\lambda' \in \Lambda^+, \lambda' \triangleright \lambda \\ U, V \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda')}} r_{UV} \cdot \varphi_{UV}$$

with $r_{T'}, r_{UV} \in R$, where $r_{T'}$ does not depend on S . Then by rewriting φ as a linear combination of the basis elements in $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ and by combining the formulas in Lemma 2.4, we obtain the second equality. By a similar argument, applying the third and fourth formulas in Lemma 2.4 instead, the first equality also holds. The theorem follows. $\square$

2.7. (cf. [DR1]). Let A be a standardly based algebra on Λ as given in 2.2. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let $f_\lambda : J(\lambda) \times I(\lambda) \rightarrow R$ be a function, whose value $f_\lambda(j, i')$ at $(j, i') \in J(\lambda) \times I(\lambda)$ is defined by

$$a_{ij}^\lambda a_{i'j'}^\lambda \equiv f_\lambda(j, i') a_{ij'}^\lambda \pmod{A(> \lambda)}.$$

The function f_λ induces a bilinear form $\beta_\lambda : A^\lambda \times A^\lambda \rightarrow R$ such that $\beta_\lambda(a_{ij}^\lambda, a_{i'j'}^\lambda) = f_\lambda(j', i)$, where A^λ is the free R -submodule of A spanned by a_{ij}^λ for all $(i, j) \in I(\lambda) \times J(\lambda)$. We say A is a standardly full-based algebra if $\text{Im}(\beta_\lambda) = R$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

The following result has been proved by Du and Rui [DR2, (3.2.1), (4.2.7)].

Theorem 2.8 ([DR2]). *Suppose that A is a standardly based algebra.*

(i) *Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring. If A is a standardly full-based algebra, then A is a quasi-hereditary algebra over R in the sense of [CPS].*

(ii) *If R is a commutative local Noetherian ring, then A is split quasi-hereditary if and only if A is a standardly full-based algebra.*

2.9. We shall show that the $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ turns out to be a standardly full-based algebra under a certain condition. For $(\lambda, 1) \in \Omega$, put $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)})$, $\lambda^{(i)} = (\lambda_1^{(i)}, \dots, \lambda_{n_i}^{(i)})$ and take the smallest positive integer l such that $|\lambda^{(l)}| \neq 0$ ($1 \leq l \leq r$). Note that $l \neq r$ since $(\lambda, 1) \in \Omega$. Then, one can define an r -partition $\lambda^\dagger$ associated to λ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^\dagger &= (\lambda^{\dagger(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{\dagger(r)}), \\ \lambda^{\dagger(l)} &= (\underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{|\lambda^{(l)}|-1 \text{ times}}, \lambda^{\dagger(l+1)} = (\underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{|\lambda^{(l+1)}|+1 \text{ times}}), \\ \lambda^{\dagger(j)} &= (\underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{|\lambda^{(j)}| \text{ times}}) \quad (j \neq l, l+1). \end{aligned}$$

(If $|\lambda^{(j)}| = 0$ then $\lambda^{\dagger(j)}$ is the empty partition.)

We remark that $\lambda^\dagger$ is defined only when $(\lambda, 1) \in \Omega$, and it satisfies the property

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{a}(\lambda) > \mathbf{a}(\lambda^\dagger).$$

Moreover, let $T^{\lambda^\dagger}$ be a semistandard λ -Tableau of type $\lambda^\dagger$ in which the entries are laid in increasing order from “left-upper” to right along the rows. (The “left-upper” means that the left has priority over the upper.) For example, if $\lambda = ((3, 2, 1), (2, 2))$ then $\lambda^\dagger = ((1^5), (1^5))$ and

$$T^{\lambda^\dagger} = \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline (1,1) & (2,1) & (3,1) \\ \hline (4,1) & (5,1) & \\ \hline (1,2) & & \\ \hline \end{array} , \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline (2,2) & (3,2) \\ \hline (4,2) & (5,2) \\ \hline \end{array} \right).$$

Thus, if $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ and $\lambda^\dagger(\mathfrak{s}) = T^{\lambda^\dagger}$ then $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^\lambda$.

Finally, let

$$P_n(q, Q_1, \dots, Q_r) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + q + \dots + q^{i-1}) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} \prod_{-n < k < n} (q^{2k} Q_j - Q_{j+1}).$$

We have the following result.

Proposition 2.10. *Assume that R is a commutative Noetherian ring. Suppose that $P_n(q, Q_1, \dots, Q_r) \in R$ is invertible, and $\lambda^\dagger \in \Lambda^+$ for any $(\lambda, 1) \in \Omega$. Then $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ is the standardly full-based, and hence is quasi-hereditary over R .*

Proof. For all $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega$, it is enough to show that there exists some $T \in I(\lambda, \varepsilon) \cap J(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ such that $(\varphi_{TT})^2 \equiv r \cdot \varphi_{TT} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, \varepsilon)}}$ with $r \in R$ invertible. If $(\lambda, 0) \in \Omega$ then one can take $T = T^\lambda$. Since $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$ is the identity map on M^λ , this case is immediate.

Assume that $(\lambda, 1) \in \Omega$. First, we claim that

$$(2.7) \quad m_\lambda \cdot (L_{|\lambda^{(l)}|} - Q_{l+1}) \equiv (q^{2k} Q_l - Q_{l+1}) \cdot m_\lambda \pmod{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}$$

where l is the integer attached to λ as in 2.9, and k is some integer such that $|k| < n$ and $\mathcal{H}^\lambda$ is as in 1.4. In fact, applying James-Mathas' result [JM, Proposition 3.7] for $\mathfrak{t}^\lambda$ and $|\lambda^{(l)}|$, we see that $m_\lambda \cdot L_{|\lambda^{(l)}|} \equiv q^{2k} Q_l \cdot m_\lambda \pmod{\mathcal{H}^\lambda}$ and hence (2.7) holds.

Now, by (2.6) and by our assumption, one can choose the element $\varphi_{T^{\lambda^\dagger} T^{\lambda^\dagger}} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$. For any $\mu' \in \Lambda$, we have $\varphi_{T^{\lambda^\dagger} T^{\lambda^\dagger}}(m_{\mu'}) = \delta_{\mu' \lambda^\dagger} \cdot m_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \mathfrak{t}^\lambda} = \delta_{\mu' \lambda^\dagger} \cdot m_\lambda$. Hence

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} (\varphi_{T^{\lambda^\dagger} T^{\lambda^\dagger}})^2(m_{\mu'}) &= \delta_{\mu' \lambda^\dagger} (\varphi_{T^{\lambda^\dagger} T^{\lambda^\dagger}})(m_\lambda) = \delta_{\mu' \lambda^\dagger} (\varphi_{T^{\lambda^\dagger} T^{\lambda^\dagger}})(u_\lambda^+ x_\lambda) \\ &= \delta_{\mu' \lambda^\dagger} (\varphi_{T^{\lambda^\dagger} T^{\lambda^\dagger}})(m_{\lambda^\dagger} (L_{|\lambda^{(l)}|} - Q_{l+1}) x_\lambda) \\ &= \delta_{\mu' \lambda^\dagger} \cdot m_\lambda (L_{|\lambda^{(l)}|} - Q_{l+1}) x_\lambda \end{aligned}$$

where the second and the third equality follows from the definition of m_λ and $m_{\lambda^\dagger}$, respectively. Note that $m_\lambda x_\lambda = P(q) m_\lambda$ where $P(q)$ is some products of Poincaré polynomials. Therefore, by (2.7), we have

$$(\varphi_{T^{\lambda^\dagger} T^{\lambda^\dagger}})^2(m_{\mu'}) = \begin{cases} P(q) \cdot (q^{2k} Q_l - Q_{l+1}) m_\lambda + h & \text{if } \mu' = \lambda^\dagger \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $h \in \mathcal{H}^\lambda$. Now, by definition, $(\varphi_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger})^2(m_{\lambda^\dagger}) \in M^{\lambda^\dagger*} \cap M^{\lambda^\dagger}$. So, by [DJMa, Proposition 6.3], $(\varphi_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger})^2(m_{\lambda^\dagger}) = \sum r_{UV} m_{UV}$ where $r_{UV} \in R$ and the sum is over $U, V \in \mathcal{T}_0(\alpha, \lambda^\dagger)$ for some $\alpha \in \Lambda^+$. Hence, by (2.8) and by a property of cellular basis, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} P(q) \cdot (q^{2k}Q_l - Q_{l+1})m_\lambda &\equiv (\varphi_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger})^2(m_{\lambda^\dagger}) \pmod{\mathcal{H}^\lambda} \\ &= m_\lambda(L_{|\lambda(l)|} - Q_{l+1})x_\lambda = m_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger}(L_{|\lambda(l)|} - Q_{l+1})x_\lambda \\ &= \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \lambda^\dagger)} r_{T'} m_{T\lambda^\dagger T'} + \sum_{U', V'} r_{U'V'} m_{U'V'} \end{aligned}$$

where $r_{T'}, r_{U'V'} \in R$ and the last sum is over $U', V' \in \mathcal{T}_0(\alpha, \lambda^\dagger)$ for $\alpha \in \Lambda^+$ such that $\alpha \triangleright \lambda$. Comparing the coefficient of $m_{T\lambda^\dagger T'}$ on both sides reveals that $r_{T\lambda^\dagger} = P(q) \cdot (q^{2k}Q_l - Q_{l+1})$ and $r_{T'} = 0$ unless $T' = T\lambda^\dagger$. Thus, $(\varphi_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger})^2(m_{\lambda^\dagger}) = P(q) \cdot (q^{2k}Q_l - Q_{l+1})(\varphi_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger})(m_{\lambda^\dagger}) + \sum_{U', V'} r_{U'V'} \varphi_{U'V'}(m_{\lambda^\dagger})$. Consequently, $(\varphi_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger})^2 \equiv P(q) \cdot (q^{2k}Q_l - Q_{l+1}) \cdot \varphi_{T\lambda^\dagger T\lambda^\dagger} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 1)}}$. By our assumption, $P(q) \cdot (q^{2k}Q_l - Q_{l+1})$ is invertible and the proposition follows. $\square$

§3 A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ AND $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$

3.1. We shall describe a relationship between the original cyclotomic q -Schur algebra $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ and its R -subalgebra $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$.

Because $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ is equipped with the involution $*$, we can define subsets $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^*$, $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)^*$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ by

$$\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^* = \{\varphi^* \mid \varphi \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)\}, \quad \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)^* = \{\varphi_{ST}^* \mid \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)\},$$

respectively. Then $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^*$ is an R -subalgebra of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Moreover, observe that $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^*$ turns out to be a standardly based algebra on $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)^*$ by applying the involution $*$ to Theorem 2.6.

Proposition 3.2. $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cdot \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^* = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \varphi_{T\lambda T\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^*$.

Proof. For all $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ with $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu), \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu) \neq \emptyset$ and for any $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)$, we certainly have $\varphi_{ST\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ and hence $(\varphi_{TT\lambda})^* = \varphi_{T\lambda T} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)^*$. Moreover, by using (2.2), we see that all the basis $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda)$ for $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ is contained in $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cdot \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^*$. Hence $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cdot \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^*$. Finally, for any $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)$, we see that $\varphi_{ST\lambda} \varphi_{T\lambda T} = \varphi_{ST\lambda} \varphi_{T\lambda T\lambda} \varphi_{T\lambda T} \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \varphi_{T\lambda T\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)^*$, so the last equality follows. $\square$

Next we introduce the Weyl module for $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$. By (2.5) in Theorem 2.6, it is easy to see that R -modules $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)(\geq (\lambda, \varepsilon))$ and $\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, \varepsilon)} = \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)(> (\lambda, \varepsilon))$ are two-sided ideals of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$. Fix a $(\lambda, \varepsilon) \in \Omega$. For $S \in I(\lambda, \varepsilon)$, we define the Weyl module $Z_S^{(\lambda, \varepsilon)}$ for $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ by the R -submodule of $\{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)(\geq (\lambda, \varepsilon))\} / \{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)(> (\lambda, \varepsilon))\}$ with basis $\{\varphi_{ST} + \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, \varepsilon)} \mid T \in J(\lambda, \varepsilon)\}$. Moreover, by (2.5), we see that $Z_S^{(\lambda, \varepsilon)}$ is the right $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module and the action of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ on $Z_S^{(\lambda, \varepsilon)}$ is independent of the choice of S , i.e., $Z_{S_1}^{(\lambda, \varepsilon)} \simeq Z_{S_2}^{(\lambda, \varepsilon)}$ for all $S_1, S_2 \in I(\lambda, \varepsilon)$. However, since T^λ is not an element in $I(\lambda, 1)$ for $(\lambda, 1) \in \Omega$, one should pay attention that there is no “canonical”-Weyl module for the case $(\lambda, 1)$. (That is, we can not define $Z_{T^\lambda}^{(\lambda, 1)}$.) For the convenience sake let

$Z^{(\lambda,0)} = Z_{T^\lambda}^{(\lambda,0)}$ and put $\varphi_T^0 = \varphi_{T^\lambda T} + \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,\varepsilon)}$ for any $T \in J(\lambda, 0) = \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. We can now prove the following.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Then there exists an isomorphism of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ -modules*

$$Z^{(\lambda,0)} \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \simeq W^\lambda$$

which maps $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \psi \otimes \varphi$ to $\varphi_{T^\lambda} \psi \varphi$.

Proof. First we note that $Z^{(\lambda,0)} = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$. In fact, since $\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ with $\mu \in \Lambda$, we have $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} = \varphi_T^0$ by (2.2). Now we can write $Z^{(\lambda,0)} \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) = (\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. On the other hand, we can also write $W^\lambda = \varphi_{T^\lambda} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ (note that $\varphi_{T^\lambda} = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} + \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}$). Hence it is enough to find two $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ -homomorphisms $f : \varphi_{T^\lambda} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \rightarrow (\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ and $g : (\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \varphi_{T^\lambda} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ such that $f(\varphi_{T^\lambda}) = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1$ and $g(\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1) = \varphi_{T^\lambda}$. We first define f . Consider the $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ -homomorphism $\tilde{f} : \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \rightarrow (\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ satisfying $\tilde{f}(\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}) = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1$. Note that $\tilde{f}$ is a well defined homomorphism. To see this we take an element $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ such that $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \varphi = 0$. Write $\varphi = \sum r_{\lambda', ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}^{\lambda'}$ for some $r_{\lambda', ST} \in R$ where $\varphi_{ST}^{\lambda'} = \varphi_{ST}$ with $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda')$ and the sum is taken over r -partitions $\lambda' \in \Lambda^+$ and semistandard tableaux $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda')$. Then, since $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$ is the identity map on M^λ and is zero on M^κ for $\lambda \neq \kappa \in \Lambda$ and $\{\varphi_{ST}^{\lambda'}\}$ is the basis for $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$, $r_{\lambda', ST} = 0$ whenever $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda', \lambda), T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda', \nu)$ with $\lambda' \in \Lambda^+$ and $\nu \in \Lambda$. It follows that $\varphi_{ST^{\lambda'}}^{\lambda'} \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ for all $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda')$ such that $r_{\lambda', ST} \neq 0$. Hence, by using (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \varphi &= \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} (\sum r_{\lambda', ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}^{\lambda'}) \\ &= \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} (\sum r_{\lambda', ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST^{\lambda'}}^{\lambda'} \varphi_{T^{\lambda'} T}^{\lambda'}) \\ &= \sum r_{\lambda', ST} (\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \varphi_{ST^{\lambda'}}^{\lambda'} \cdot \varphi_{T^{\lambda'} T}^{\lambda'}) \\ &= \sum r_{\lambda', ST} (\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{ST^{\lambda'}}^{\lambda'} \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \varphi_{T^{\lambda'} T}^{\lambda'}) \end{aligned}$$

where all sums are taken over $\lambda' \in \Lambda^+$ and $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda')$. Now we have $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \varphi_{ST^{\lambda'}}^{\lambda'} = 0$ unless S is the tableaux of type λ , and $r_{\lambda', ST} = 0$ if S is of type λ . It follows that $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \varphi = 0$ and so $\tilde{f}$ is well-defined.

Take $\varphi_{ST}^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ where $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\alpha)$ with $\alpha \in \Lambda^+$ and suppose that $0 \neq \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \varphi_{ST}^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}$. Then $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\alpha, \lambda)$ and so $\varphi_{ST}^\alpha = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \varphi_{ST}^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}$ since $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$ is the identity map on M^λ . Thus, $\alpha \triangleright \lambda$. Furthermore, again by using (2.2) and the property that $\varphi_{ST^\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$, we have $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \varphi_{ST}^\alpha = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{ST^\alpha}^\alpha \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \varphi_{T^\alpha T}^\alpha$. Since $\varphi_{ST^\alpha}^\alpha$ is an element in the standard basis $\mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ for $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\alpha \triangleright \lambda$ we have $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \varphi_{ST^\alpha}^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,1)}$. Thus, $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{ST^\alpha}^\alpha = 0$ and then $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} \varphi_{ST}^\alpha = 0$. It follows that $\tilde{f}(\mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda} \cap \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)) = 0$. So $\tilde{f}$ induces an $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ -homomorphism f from $\varphi_{T^\lambda} \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ to $(\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1) \cdot \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ such that $f(\varphi_{T^\lambda}) = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} 1$.

Next we define g . To do this we define the $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -balanced map $\tilde{g}$ from the direct product module $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \times \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ (for the right $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and the left $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$) to $\varphi_{T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ such that $\tilde{g}((\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \varphi', \varphi)) = (\varphi_{T^\lambda} \varphi') \varphi$ for any

$\varphi' \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Since the first two formulas in Lemma 2.4 assert that $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \varphi' \in \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}$ if $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \varphi' \in \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}$, we see that $\tilde{g}$ is a well-defined $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -balance map. Then by using the universality property of the tensor product, g is defined. $\square$

The following lemma is an analogy of Lemma 6.7 (i) in [SawS].

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. We regard W^λ as right $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module via the restriction. Then there exists an injective $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module homomorphism $f_\lambda : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \rightarrow W^\lambda$ such that $f_\lambda(\varphi_T^0) = \varphi_T$ for $T \in J(\lambda, 0) = \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$.*

Proof. First, We can write $Z^{(\lambda,0)} = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) / \{\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}\}$ and $W^\lambda = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) / \{\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}\}$ and, moreover, there exists an inclusion map

$$\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) / \{\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}\} \hookrightarrow \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) / \{\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}\} = W^\lambda$$

since $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Then we have a natural surjective $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module homomorphism

$$f : \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) / \{\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}\} \rightarrow \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) / \{\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}\}$$

since $\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)} \subset \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}$. But since $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda} = \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,1)} \subset \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}$, we have $(\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}) \subset \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}$. Hence $(\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}) \subset (\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)})$ and, therefore, $(\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}) = (\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)})$. Consequently, f is an isomorphism. The statement for the basis now clear. $\square$

Take a $(\lambda, 0) \in \Omega$. Then $I(\lambda, 0) = J(\lambda, 0) = \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Hence, by (2.5) in Theorem 2.6, we have the following.

3.5. Suppose that $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Then there exists an element $r_{ST} \in R$ such that for any $U, V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$

$$\varphi_{US} \cdot \varphi_{TV} \equiv r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{UV} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}}.$$

We define a bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0 : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \times Z^{(\lambda,0)} \rightarrow R$ by $\langle \varphi_S^0, \varphi_T^0 \rangle_0 = r_{ST}$. Hence we have

$$(3.1) \quad \langle \varphi_S^0, \varphi_T^0 \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_{UV} \equiv \varphi_{US} \cdot \varphi_{TV} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}},$$

where U and V are any elements of $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. It is easy to see that

$$(3.2) \quad \langle \varphi_S^0, \varphi_T^0 \rangle_0 = \langle \varphi_S, \varphi_T \rangle \quad \text{for every } S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda).$$

Let $\text{rad} Z^{(\lambda,0)} = \{x \in Z^{(\lambda,0)} \mid \langle x, y \rangle_0 = 0 \text{ for all } y \in Z^{(\lambda,0)}\}$.

Lemma 3.6. *$\text{rad} Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ is an $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -submodule of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$.*

Proof. Take $x \in \text{rad} Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ and $y \in Z^{(\lambda,0)}$, and write $x = \sum_{T_1 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_1}^{(x)} \cdot \varphi_{T_1}^0$ and $y = \sum_{T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_2}^{(y)} \cdot \varphi_{T_2}^0 \in Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ with $r_{T_1}^{(x)}, r_{T_2}^{(y)} \in R$. Then, for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$, we have $\langle x\varphi, y \rangle_0 = \sum_{T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_1}^{(x)} r_{T_2}^{(y)} \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0 \varphi, \varphi_{T_2}^0 \rangle_0$. We claim that

$$(3.3) \quad \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0 \varphi, \varphi_{T_2}^0 \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_{S_1 S_2} \equiv (\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \varphi) \varphi_{T_2 S_2} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda,0)}}$$

for any $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. In fact, since $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0)$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$, Theorem 2.6 implies that

$$\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi \equiv \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{(\lambda, 0), T}(T_1, \varphi) \cdot \varphi_{S_1 T} \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)}}$$

where $f_{(\lambda, 0), T}(T_1, \varphi) \in R$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi) \cdot \varphi_{T_2 S_2} &\equiv \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{(\lambda, 0), T}(T_1, \varphi) \cdot \varphi_{S_1 T} \cdot \varphi_{T_2 S_2} \\ &\equiv \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{(\lambda, 0), T}(T_1, \varphi) \cdot \langle \varphi_T^0, \varphi_{T_2}^0 \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_{S_1 S_2} \\ &\equiv \left\langle \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{(\lambda, 0), T}(T_1, \varphi) \cdot \varphi_T^0, \varphi_{T_2}^0 \right\rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_{S_1 S_2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the definition of $\varphi_{T_1}^0$ and by Theorem 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{T_1}^0 \cdot \varphi &= (\varphi_{T^\lambda T_1} + \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)}) \cdot \varphi = \varphi_{T^\lambda T_1} \cdot \varphi + \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)} \\ &= \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{(\lambda, 0), T}(T_1, \varphi) \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} + \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)} = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{(\lambda, 0), T}(T_1, \varphi) \cdot \varphi_T^0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)}$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ in the second equality. (3.3) follows from this. By Theorem 2.6, one can write $\varphi \cdot \varphi_{T_2 S_2} = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S, (\lambda, 0)}(\varphi, T_2) \varphi_{S S_2}$. Then by (3.3), we have, for $T_2, S_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0 \varphi, \varphi_{T_2}^0 \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_{S_1 S_2} &\equiv (\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi) \cdot \varphi_{T_2 S_2} = \varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot (\varphi \cdot \varphi_{T_2 S_2}) \\ &\equiv \varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S, (\lambda, 0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \varphi_{S S_2} \right) \\ &\equiv \sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S, (\lambda, 0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0, \varphi_S^0 \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_{S_1 S_2} \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from (3.1). Since $\varphi_{S_1 S_2}$ are free R -basis of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\varphi_{S_1 S_2} \notin \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)}$, we have

$$\langle \varphi_{T_1}^0 \varphi, \varphi_{T_2}^0 \rangle_0 = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S, (\lambda, 0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0, \varphi_S^0 \rangle_0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle x\varphi, y \rangle_0 &= \sum_{T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_1}^{(x)} \cdot r_{T_2}^{(y)} \cdot \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0 \varphi, \varphi_{T_2}^0 \rangle_0 \\
&= \sum_{T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_1}^{(x)} r_{T_2}^{(y)} \cdot \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S,(\lambda,0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0, \varphi_S^0 \rangle_0 \right) \\
&= \sum_{T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_2}^{(y)} \cdot \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S,(\lambda,0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \left(\sum_{T_1 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_1}^{(x)} \cdot \langle \varphi_{T_1}^0, \varphi_S^0 \rangle_0 \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_2}^{(y)} \cdot \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S,(\lambda,0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \langle x, \varphi_S^0 \rangle_0 \right) \\
&= \langle x, \sum_{T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_2}^{(y)} \cdot \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S,(\lambda,0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \varphi_S^0 \right) \rangle_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T_2}^{(y)} \cdot \left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} f_{S,(\lambda,0)}(\varphi, T_2) \cdot \varphi_S^0 \right) \in Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ and $x \in \text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$, the last formula is equal to 0. This shows that $x\varphi \in \text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. It is immediate that if $x_1, x_2 \in \text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ then $x_1 + x_2 \in \text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. Thus, the lemma follows. $\square$

We put $L_0^\lambda = Z^{(\lambda,0)} / \text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. Then we have the following.

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose that R is a field, and $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Then*

- (i) $L_0^\lambda \neq 0$ and
- (ii) $\text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ is the unique maximal submodule of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ and L_0^λ is absolutely irreducible. Moreover, the Jacobson radical of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ is equal to $\text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$.

Proof. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we have $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \in Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ and $\varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}^0 \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}^0 = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}^0$. Hence $\langle \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0, \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \rangle_0 = 1 \neq 0$. Thus, $\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \notin \text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$, and we have $L_0^\lambda \neq 0$. This proves (i). Let $x \in Z^{(\lambda,0)} \setminus \text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. Then $\langle x, y \rangle_0 \neq 0$ for some $y \in Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. We write $y = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_S \cdot \varphi_S^0$. For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ set $y_T = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_S \cdot \varphi_{ST}$, an element of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$. Moreover, write $x = \sum_{U \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r'_U \cdot \varphi_U^0$. We note that $\varphi_U^0 \cdot \varphi_{ST} = \langle \varphi_U^0, \varphi_S^0 \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_T^0$ in $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ by (3.1). Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
xy_T &= \sum_{S, U \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_S r'_U \cdot \varphi_U^0 \varphi_{ST} = \sum_{S, U \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_S r'_U \cdot \langle \varphi_U^0, \varphi_S^0 \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_T^0 \\
&= \left\langle \sum_{U \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r'_U \varphi_U^0, \sum_{S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_S \varphi_S^0 \right\rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_T^0 = \langle x, y \rangle_0 \cdot \varphi_T^0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now R is a field and $\langle x, y \rangle_0 \neq 0$. Hence we have $x \cdot (1/\langle x, y \rangle_0) \cdot y_T = \varphi_T^0$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Consequently, x generates $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ as an $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module. This argument can be applied to any element of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ which does not belong to the radical. It follows that $\text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ is the unique maximal proper submodule of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ and L_0^λ is irreducible. The same argument shows that L_0^λ is irreducible for any extension field of R , so L_0^λ is absolutely irreducible. This proves (ii). $\square$

§4 A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ AND $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$

First, we recall the definition of modified Ariki-Koike algebras and their cyclotomic q -Schur algebras ([SawS]).

4.1. From now on, throughout this paper, we consider the following condition on parameters $Q_1, \dots, Q_r$ in R whenever we consider the modified Ariki-Koike algebras (and their cyclotomic q -Schur algebras).

(4.1) $Q_i - Q_j$ are invertible in R for any $i \neq j$.

Let A be a square matrix of degree r whose i - j entry is given by Q_j^{i-1} for $1 \leq i, j \leq r$. Thus A is the Vandermonde matrix, and $\Delta = \det A = \prod_{i>j} (Q_i - Q_j)$ is invertible by (4.1). We express the inverse of A as $A^{-1} = \Delta^{-1}B$ with $B = (h_{ij})$, and define a polynomial $F_i(X) \in R[X]$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$, by $F_i(X) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} h_{ij} X^{j-1}$.

The modified Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}^b = \mathcal{H}_{n,r}^b$ is an associative algebra over R with generators $T_2, \dots, T_n$ and $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ and relations

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.2) \quad & (T_i - q)(T_i + q^{-1}) = 0 & (2 \leq i \leq n), \\
 & (\xi_i - Q_1) \cdots (\xi_i - Q_r) = 0 & (1 \leq i \leq n), \\
 & T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1} & (2 \leq i \leq n), \\
 & T_i T_j = T_j T_i & (|i - j| \geq 2), \\
 & \xi_i \xi_j = \xi_j \xi_i & (1 \leq i, j \leq n), \\
 & T_j \xi_j = \xi_{j-1} T_j + \Delta^{-2} \sum_{\substack{c_1 < c_2 \\ c_1 < c_2}} (Q_{c_2} - Q_{c_1})(q - q^{-1}) F_{c_1}(\xi_{j-1}) F_{c_2}(\xi_j), \\
 & T_j \xi_{j-1} = \xi_j T_j - \Delta^{-2} \sum_{\substack{c_1 < c_2 \\ c_1 < c_2}} (Q_{c_2} - Q_{c_1})(q - q^{-1}) F_{c_1}(\xi_{j-1}) F_{c_2}(\xi_j), \\
 & T_j \xi_k = \xi_j T_j & (k \neq j - 1, j).
 \end{aligned}$$

It is known that if $R = \mathbb{Q}(\bar{q}, \bar{Q}_1, \dots, \bar{Q}_r)$, the field of rational functions with variables $\bar{q}, \bar{Q}_1, \dots, \bar{Q}_r$, $\mathcal{H}^b$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}$, and it gives an alternate presentation of $\mathcal{H}$ apart from 1.1.

The subalgebra $\mathcal{H}^b(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ of $\mathcal{H}^b$ generated by $T_2, \dots, T_n$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}_n$, hence it can be naturally identified with the corresponding subalgebra $\mathcal{H}(\mathfrak{S}_n)$ of $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, it is known by [S] that the set $\{\xi_1^{c_1} \cdots \xi_n^{c_n} T_w \mid w \in \mathfrak{S}_n, 0 \leq c_i < r \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ gives rise to a basis of $\mathcal{H}^b$.

Let $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r V_i$ be a free R -module, with $\text{rank } V_i = m_i$. We put $m = \sum m_i$. It is known by [SakS] that we can define a right $\mathcal{H}$ -module structure on $V^{\otimes n}$. We denote this representation by $\rho : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \text{End } V^{\otimes n}$. Note that this construction works without the condition (4.1). Also it is shown in [S] that, under the assumption (4.1), a right action of $\mathcal{H}^b$ on $V^{\otimes n}$ can be defined. We denote this representation by $\rho^b : \mathcal{H}^b \rightarrow \text{End } V^{\otimes n}$. By [S, Lemma 3.5], we know that $\text{Im } \rho \subset \text{Im } \rho^b$.

We consider the condition

$$(4.3) \quad m_i \geq n \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, r.$$

Lemma 4.2 ([SawS, Lemma 1.5]). *Under the conditions (4.1), (4.3), there exists an R -algebra homomorphism $\rho_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^b$ such that ρ_0 induces the identity on $\mathcal{H}_n$. (Here we regard $\mathcal{H}_n \subset \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{H}_n \subset \mathcal{H}^b$ under the previous identifications.) If $\text{Imp}^b = \text{Imp}$ and R is a field, then $\mathcal{H} \simeq \mathcal{H}^b$.*

From now on, throughout the paper, we fix an r -tuple $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_r)$ of non-negative integers and always assume the condition (4.3) whenever we consider $\mathcal{H}^b$.

Any $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}(\mathbf{m})$ may be regarded as an element in $\mathcal{P}_{n,1}$ (i.e, 1-composition) of n by arranging the entries of $\mu = (\mu_j^{(i)})$ in order

$$\mu_1^{(1)}, \dots, \mu_{m_1}^{(1)}, \mu_1^{(2)}, \dots, \mu_{m_2}^{(2)}, \dots, \mu_1^{(r)}, \dots, \mu_{m_r}^{(r)},$$

which we denote by $\{\mu\}$.

For $\alpha = (n_1, \dots, n_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\sum n_i = n$, we define $c(\alpha)$ by

$$c(\alpha) = (\underbrace{r, \dots, r}_{n_1\text{-times}}, \underbrace{r-1, \dots, r-1}_{n_2\text{-times}}, \dots, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n_r\text{-times}})$$

and let $c(\alpha) = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$. We define $F_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}^b$ by $F_\alpha = \Delta^{-n} F_{c_1}(\xi_1) F_{c_2}(\xi_2) \cdots F_{c_n}(\xi_n)$. For any $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$, put $m_\mu^b = F_{\alpha(\mu)} \cdot m_{\{\mu\}}$ where $m_{\{\mu\}} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\{\mu\}}} q^{l(w)} T_w (= x_\mu) \in \mathcal{H}_n$.

We define an R -linear anti-automorphism $h \rightarrow h^*$ on $\mathcal{H}^b$ by the condition that $*$ fixes the generators T_i ($2 \leq i \leq n$) and ξ_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$). As discussed in [SawS, 2.7], this condition induces a well-defined anti-automorphism on $\mathcal{H}^b$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.9 in [SawS], we know that $(m_\mu^b)^* = m_\mu^b$. For $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$, we define an element $m_{\mathfrak{st}}^b \in \mathcal{H}^b$ by $m_{\mathfrak{st}}^b = T_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* m_\mu^b T_{d(\mathfrak{t})}$. By the above fact, we have $(m_{\mathfrak{st}}^b)^* = m_{\mathfrak{ts}}^b$.

Theorem 4.3 ([SawS, Theorem 2.18]). *The modified Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}^b$ is free as an R -module with cellular basis $\{m_{\mathfrak{st}}^b \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}\}$.*

Put $M_b^\mu = m_\mu^b \mathcal{H}^b$ for $\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$. We define a cyclotomic q -Schur algebra $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ as follows.

Definition 4.4. *The cyclotomic q -Schur algebra for $\mathcal{H}^b$ with weight poset $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$ is the endomorphism algebra*

$$\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{H}^b}(M^b(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r})), \quad \text{where } M^b(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}} M_b^\mu.$$

For an r -tuples $\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,1}$, let $M_b^\alpha = \bigoplus_{\mu; \alpha(\mu)=\alpha} M_b^\mu$. Then by Proposition 5.2 (i) in [SawS], we have $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n) \simeq \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,1}} \text{End}_{\mathcal{H}^b} M_b^\alpha$ as R -algebras.

Theorem 4.5 ([SawS, Theorem 5.5]). *Let $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ be the cyclotomic q -Schur algebra associated to the modified Ariki-Koike algebra $\mathcal{H}^b$ and $\mathcal{S}(m_i, n_i)$ be the q -Schur algebra associated to the Iwahori-Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_{n_i}$. Then there exists an isomorphism of R -algebras*

$$\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n) \simeq \bigoplus_{\substack{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \\ n = n_1 + \dots + n_r}} \mathcal{S}(m_1, n_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{S}(m_r, n_r).$$

Let $\mu, \nu \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$. We assume that $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)$. For $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$, put

$$m_{ST}^b = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \mu(\mathfrak{s})=S, \nu(\mathfrak{t})=T}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} m_{\mathfrak{st}}^b.$$

Moreover, for $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$, one can define $\varphi_{ST}^b \in \mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ by $\varphi_{ST}^b(m_\alpha^b h) = \delta_{\alpha\nu} m_{ST}^b h$, for all $h \in \mathcal{H}^b$ and all $\alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$.

Theorem 4.6 ([SawS, Theorem 5.9]). *The cyclotomic q -Schur algebra $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ is free as an R -module with cellular basis $\mathcal{C}^b(\mathbf{m}, n) = \{\varphi_{ST}^b \mid S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda), \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}\}$.*

4.7. Let $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ be as in Section 2. We describe a relationship between the algebra $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and the cyclotomic q -Schur algebra $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ in the case where $\Lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$. But in the moment, we shall consider an arbitrary Λ as in Section 2.

First, let $\mathcal{C}^{00}(\Lambda) = \{\varphi_{ST} \mid (S, T) \in I(\lambda, 1) \times J(\lambda, 1), \lambda \in \Lambda^+\} \subset \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$ be the R -span of $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^{00}(\Lambda)$, which is an R -submodule of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$. We note that, $\mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ by the second and fourth formula in Lemma 2.4. Thus one can define the quotient algebra $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)/\mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$. We write $\bar{x} = x + \mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$ ($x \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$). It is easy to see that $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ has a free R -basis $\{\bar{\varphi}_{ST} \mid S \in I(\lambda, 0), T \in J(\lambda, 0), \lambda \in \Lambda^+\}$. Note that the condition $(S, T) \in I(\lambda, 0) \times J(\lambda, 0)$ is nothing but $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, let $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}^{\vee\lambda} = \overline{\mathcal{S}^0}^{\vee}(\Lambda)^\lambda$ be the R -submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ spanned by $\bar{\varphi}_{ST}$ with $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\alpha)$ for various $\alpha \in \Lambda^+$ such that $\alpha \triangleright \lambda$. We show the following.

Theorem 4.8. *The algebra $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ has a free basis*

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}^0}(\Lambda) = \{\bar{\varphi}_{ST} \mid S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda^+\}$$

satisfying the following properties.

(i) *The R -linear map $* : \overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ determined by $\bar{\varphi}_{ST}^* = \bar{\varphi}_{TS}$, for all $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ and all $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, is an anti-automorphism of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$.*

(ii) *Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Then for all $\bar{\varphi} \in \overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$, and any $V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$, there exists $r_V \in R$ such that*

$$\bar{\varphi}_{ST} \cdot \bar{\varphi} \equiv \sum_{V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_V \bar{\varphi}_{SV} \pmod{\mathcal{S}^{\vee\lambda}_0}$$

for any $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$, where r_V is independent of the choice of T .

In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{C}^0}(\Lambda)$ is a cellular basis of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$.

Proof. To show (i) we first take a small detour. Let $f : \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ be the R -linear map given by

$$f(\varphi_{ST}) = \begin{cases} \bar{\varphi}_{TS} & \text{if } \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \Lambda^+, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We claim that f is a surjective algebra anti-homomorphism. It is clear from the definition that f is surjective. Then, to prove the claim it suffices to show the equations

$$(4.4) \quad f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \varphi_{S_2 T_2}) = f(\varphi_{S_2 T_2}) \cdot f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1})$$

for all $S_i, T_i \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda_i)$, $\lambda_i \in \Lambda^+$ ($i = 1, 2$) and

$$(4.5) \quad f(1_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)}) = 1_{\overline{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)}}.$$

We show (4.5). By applying f to (2.4), we have

$$f(1_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)}) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} \sum_{S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_{T, S} \cdot \overline{\varphi_{ST}} = \overline{(1_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)})^*} = \overline{1}_{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)} = 1_{\overline{\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)}}$$

where $*$ is the involution of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$. Hence we obtain (4.5). We show (4.4). There are three cases to consider. First, if $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$ with some $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ then $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2} \in \mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$ by Lemma 2.4 and hence $f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \varphi_{S_2 T_2}) = 0 = f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1})$, so we are done in this case. Similarly, it holds if $\varphi_{S_2 T_2} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$ with some $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. So, we only need to check the case where $\varphi_{S_i T_i} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda_i, 0)$ with some $\lambda_i \in \Lambda^+$ ($i = 1, 2$). Let $\mu_i, \nu_i \in \Lambda$ with $\alpha(\lambda_i) = \alpha(\mu_i) = \alpha(\nu_i)$ and $S_i \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda_i, \mu_i)$, $T_i \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda_i, \nu_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). If $\nu_1 \neq \mu_2$ then $\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2} = 0 = \varphi_{T_2 S_2} \cdot \varphi_{T_1 S_1}$. Hence we have

$$f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2}) = 0 = \overline{\varphi_{T_2 S_2} \cdot \varphi_{T_1 S_1}} = \overline{\varphi}_{T_2 S_2} \cdot \overline{\varphi}_{T_1 S_1} = f(\varphi_{S_2 T_2}) \cdot f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1}).$$

So we may assume that $\nu_1 = \mu_2$. It is easy to see from our assumptions that $\mathbf{a}(\mu_1) = \mathbf{a}(\mu_2)$. Hence, for $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_1)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu_2)$, if $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$ then $\varphi_{TS} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$. Therefore, by the first formula in Lemma 2.4, we have

$$(4.6) \quad \varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2} = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \geq \lambda_1, S, T \\ \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0)}} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST} + \sum_{\substack{\lambda \geq \lambda_1, S, T \\ \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)}} r_{ST} \cdot \varphi_{ST}$$

where $r_{ST} \in R$ and both sums are taken over r -partitions $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$ and semistandard Tableaux $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_1)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu_2)$. This gives us two formulas. First, we have

$$(4.7) \quad f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2}) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \geq \lambda_1, S, T \\ \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0)}} r_{ST} \cdot \overline{\varphi}_{TS}.$$

Secondly, by applying the involution $*$ of $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ on both sides,

$$(4.8) \quad \overline{\varphi_{T_2 S_2} \cdot \varphi_{T_1 S_1}} = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \geq \lambda_1, S, T \\ \varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 0)}} r_{ST} \cdot \overline{\varphi}_{TS}$$

since in the second sum in (4.6), we have $\varphi_{ST}^* = \varphi_{TS} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\lambda, 1)$. Comparing (4.7) and (4.8), we have

$$f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1} \cdot \varphi_{S_2 T_2}) = \overline{\varphi_{T_2 S_2} \cdot \varphi_{T_1 S_1}} = \overline{\varphi_{T_2 S_2}} \cdot \overline{\varphi_{T_1 S_1}} = f(\varphi_{S_2 T_2}) \cdot f(\varphi_{S_1 T_1}).$$

This proves our claim. By definition of f , we have $\ker f = \mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$. Hence f induces an algebra anti-automorphism on $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)/\mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$, which maps $\overline{\varphi}_{ST}$ to $\overline{\varphi}_{TS}$ for any $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Thus (i) holds. Then (ii) follows from the second formula of (2.5) by applying the natural map $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$. $\square$

In the case where $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ is defined, $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ can be identified with $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$, i.e., we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\Lambda = \widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$ and assume that (4.1) and (4.3) holds. Then there exists an algebra isomorphism $\flat : \overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ satisfying the following. For $\overline{\varphi}_{ST} \in \overline{\mathcal{C}^0}(\Lambda)$ such that $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we have $(\overline{\varphi}_{ST})^\flat = \varphi_{ST}^b$.*

Proof. By assumption, $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ is defined. Now [SawS, Proposition 6.4 (ii)] says that there exists a surjective algebra homomorphism $\widehat{f} : \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ such that

$$\widehat{f}(\varphi_{ST}) = \begin{cases} \varphi_{ST}^b & \text{if } S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $\varphi_{ST} \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Lambda)$. Then $\ker \widehat{f} = \mathcal{S}^{00}(\Lambda)$ and so $\widehat{f}$ induces an algebra isomorphism $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$, which maps $\overline{\varphi}_{ST}$ to φ_{ST}^b for any $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda^+ = \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$. We obtain the result. $\square$

We now return to the general setting, and consider $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ for arbitrary Λ . The above proposition says that the $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ is a natural "cover" of the $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$.

For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $\overline{\varphi}_\lambda = \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$ is an element in $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$. Hence, by the cellular theory [GL], one can define a Weyl module $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda$ of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ as the right $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ -submodule of $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)/\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}^{\vee\lambda}$ spanned by the image of $\overline{\varphi}_\lambda$. We denote by $\overline{\varphi}_T$ the image of $\overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)/\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}^{\vee\lambda}$. Then the set $\{\overline{\varphi}_T \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)\}$ is a free R -basis of $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda$. Define a bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}}$ on $\overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda$ by requiring that

$$\overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda S} \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \equiv \langle \overline{\varphi}_S, \overline{\varphi}_T \rangle_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}} \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\lambda \pmod{\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}^{\vee\lambda}}$$

for all $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda = \overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda / \text{rad} \overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda$, where $\text{rad} \overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda = \{x \in \overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda \mid \langle x, y \rangle_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}} = 0 \text{ for all } y \in \overline{\mathcal{Z}}^\lambda\}$. In the case where R is a field, by a general theory of cellular algebras, the set $\{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^+, \overline{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda \neq 0\}$ gives a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ -modules. Furthermore, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.10. *Suppose that R is a field. Then $\overline{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda \neq 0$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Hence, $\{\overline{\mathcal{L}}^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^+\}$ is a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ -modules. Therefore, $\overline{\mathcal{S}^0}(\Lambda)$ is quasi-hereditary.*

Proof. We have $\overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \equiv \langle \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda}, \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda} \rangle_{\overline{0}} \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\lambda \pmod{\overline{\mathcal{S}}_0^{\vee\lambda}}$. But since $\overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} = \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$, we see that $\langle \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda}, \overline{\varphi}_{T^\lambda} \rangle_{\overline{0}} = 1$, and so $\overline{L}^\lambda$ is non-zero. In particular, $\overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda)$ is a standardly full-based algebra (see Definition in 2.7). Hence Theorem 2.8 gives us that $\overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda)$ is quasi-hereditary. The proposition is proved. $\square$

Lemma 4.11. *Suppose that $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Then there exists an $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module isomorphism $h_\lambda : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \rightarrow \overline{Z}^\lambda$ such that $h_\lambda(\varphi_T^0) = \overline{\varphi}_T$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$, where $\overline{Z}^\lambda$ is regarded as an $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module via the canonical map $\pi : \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda)$.*

Proof. Let $\pi : \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda)$ be the natural surjection. Then π maps $\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee\lambda}$ to $\overline{\mathcal{S}}_0^{\vee\lambda}$, hence it induces an $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module surjective homomorphism $\overline{\pi} : \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)/\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee\lambda} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda)/\overline{\mathcal{S}}_0^{\vee\lambda}$. Here $Z^{(\lambda,0)} = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ and $\overline{Z}^\lambda = \overline{\varphi}_\lambda \overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda) = \overline{\varphi}_\lambda \mathcal{S}_0(\Lambda)$, and $\overline{\pi}(\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0) = \overline{\varphi}_\lambda$. Hence $\overline{\pi}$ induces a surjective map $h_\lambda : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \rightarrow \overline{Z}^\lambda$. Since it is easy to check that $\overline{\pi}(\varphi_T^0) = \overline{\varphi}_T$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$, the map h_λ is an isomorphism. $\square$

Combining Lemma 4.11 and Lemma 3.4, we have the following.

Lemma 4.12. *We regard $\overline{Z}^\lambda$ and W^λ as right $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -modules via the above and via the restriction, respectively. Then the map $\overline{f}_\lambda = f_\lambda \circ h_\lambda^{-1} : \overline{Z}^\lambda \rightarrow W^\lambda$, which maps $\overline{\varphi}_T$ to φ_T for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$, is an injective $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module homomorphism.*

We need two easy lemmas.

Lemma 4.13. *Suppose that R is a field. For every $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we regard $\overline{L}^\lambda$ as right $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -modules via the map π . Then $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module $\overline{L}^\lambda$ is irreducible. Furthermore, $\{\overline{L}^\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda^+, \lambda \triangleright \alpha\}$ is a complete set of pairwise inequivalent irreducible $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -modules occurring in the composition factors of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.10, we have $\overline{L}^\lambda \neq 0$. Since $\overline{L}^\lambda$ is irreducible as $\overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda)$ -module, it is irreducible as $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module. It is clear that $\{\overline{L}^\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda^+, \lambda \triangleright \alpha\}$ is a complete set of irreducible $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -modules occurring in $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.14. *Suppose that R is a field. Then, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we have $L_0^\lambda \simeq \overline{L}^\lambda$ as $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -modules.*

Proof. (The following proof is almost similar to [SawS, Lemma 6.8].) Recall the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0$ (resp. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\overline{0}}$) on $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ (resp. on $\overline{Z}^\lambda$) and the $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module isomorphism h_λ in Lemma 4.11. We note that $h_\lambda^{-1} : \overline{Z}^\lambda \rightarrow Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ maps $\text{rad } \overline{Z}^\lambda$ onto $\text{rad } Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. In fact, it is easy to see that $\langle \varphi_S^0, \varphi_T^0 \rangle_0 = \langle \overline{\varphi}_S, \overline{\varphi}_T \rangle_{\overline{0}}$ for any $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Hence $h_\lambda^{-1}(\text{rad } \overline{Z}^\lambda) = \text{rad } Z^{(\lambda,0)}$, and h_λ^{-1} induces an $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module isomorphism $\overline{L}^\lambda \rightarrow L_0^\lambda$. $\square$

The following result connects the decomposition numbers in $\overline{Z}^\lambda$ and in $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$.

Theorem 4.15. *Suppose that R is a field. Then*

- (i) $\{L_0^\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda^+, \lambda \triangleright \alpha\}$ is a complete set of pairwise inequivalent irreducible $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -modules occurring in the composition factors of the $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ -module $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$.
- (ii) For $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$, we have

$$[\overline{Z}^\lambda : \overline{L}^\mu] = [Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu].$$

(iii) For $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$ such that $\alpha(\lambda) \neq \alpha(\mu)$, we have

$$[\overline{Z}^\lambda : \overline{L}^\mu] = 0.$$

Proof. The first and the second statement follows from Lemma 4.13 and Lemma 4.14. We show the third statement.

Take $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and assume that $\alpha(\lambda) \neq \alpha(\mu)$ for $\mu \in \Lambda^+$. Let

$$0 = M_1 \subsetneq M_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_k = \overline{Z}^\lambda$$

be a composition series of $\overline{Z}^\lambda$ and assume that $M_{i+1}/M_i \simeq \overline{L}^\mu$ for some integer i with $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Note that, as in the proof of Proposition 4.10, $\overline{\varphi}_{T^\mu} + \text{rad} \overline{Z}^\mu$ is a non-zero element of $\overline{L}^\mu$. Then, there exists $c_\mu \in M_{i+1}/M_i$ corresponding to $\overline{\varphi}_{T^\mu} + \text{rad} \overline{Z}^\mu$. Take a representative $\tilde{c}_\mu \in M_{i+1} \subset \overline{Z}^\lambda$ of c_μ . Take $\varphi_\mu \in \mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda)$ (cf. (2.3)). Since M_{i+1} is an $\overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda)$ -module of $\overline{Z}^\lambda$, we have $\tilde{c}_\mu \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\mu \in M_{i+1}$. Moreover, $\tilde{c}_\mu \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\mu$ corresponds to

$$(\overline{\varphi}_{T^\mu} + \text{rad} \overline{Z}^\mu) \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\mu = \overline{\varphi}_{T^\mu} + \text{rad} \overline{Z}^\mu \neq 0$$

Therefore, $\tilde{c}_\mu \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\mu \neq 0$. On the other hand, for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$, the type of T is not equal to μ since $\alpha(\lambda) \neq \alpha(\mu)$. Hence, by the definition of φ_μ , we have $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \cdot \varphi_\mu = 0$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. This implies that $x \cdot \overline{\varphi}_\mu = 0$ for any $x \in \overline{Z}^\lambda$, a contradiction. The theorem follows. $\square$

§5 AN ESTIMATE FOR DECOMPOSITION NUMBERS

We are now ready to estimate the decomposition numbers for the cyclotomic q -Schur algebras.

5.1. We keep the notation in Section 4, and consider the general Λ . By abuse of the notation, $\mathcal{S}^0, \overline{\mathcal{S}}^0, \mathcal{S}$ denotes $\mathcal{S}^0(\Lambda), \overline{\mathcal{S}}^0(\Lambda), \mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ respectively, and $M \otimes \mathcal{S}$ denotes $M \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0} \mathcal{S}$ for any right $\mathcal{S}^0$ -module M . Suppose that $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{S}^0, \varphi \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $g_\lambda = g : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \otimes \mathcal{S} \rightarrow W^\lambda$ be the isomorphism given in Theorem 3.3. Then for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$, we have

$$\varphi_T^0 \otimes \varphi = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \otimes \varphi = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \otimes \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi \xrightarrow{g} \varphi_{T^\lambda} \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi = \varphi_T \varphi$$

where the second equality follows from $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \in \mathcal{S}^0$ since $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Thus, we see that

Remark 5.2. The $\mathcal{S}$ -module isomorphism

$$g_\lambda : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \otimes \mathcal{S} \rightarrow W^\lambda$$

in Theorem 3.3 maps $\varphi_T^0 \otimes \varphi$ to $\varphi_T \varphi$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$.

Lemma 5.3. Suppose that $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Let M_1, M_2 be non-zero $\mathcal{S}^0$ -submodules of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ with $M_1 \subsetneq M_2$, and let $\iota : M_1 \hookrightarrow M_2, \iota_1 : M_1 \hookrightarrow Z^{(\lambda,0)}, \iota_2 : M_2 \hookrightarrow Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ be inclusion maps. Then

- (i) the $\mathcal{S}$ -module homomorphism $\iota \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{S}} : M_1 \otimes \mathcal{S} \rightarrow M_2 \otimes \mathcal{S}$ is a non-zero map.
- (ii) $(\iota_1 \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{S}})(M_1 \otimes \mathcal{S})$ is a proper $\mathcal{S}$ -submodule of $(\iota_2 \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{S}})(M_2 \otimes \mathcal{S})$.

Proof. Put $I = \iota \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{S}}$, $I_i = \iota_i \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{S}}$ ($i = 1, 2$). Take $0 \neq x \in M_1$. Then, by $M_1 \subset Z^{(\lambda, 0)}$, we may write $x = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_T^0$ with $r_T \in R$. Then we have $(g \circ I)(x \otimes 1) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_T$ by Remark 5.2. Now suppose that $I(x \otimes 1) = 0$. Then $(g_\lambda \circ I)(x \otimes 1) = 0$ and so $r_T = 0$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ since $\{\varphi_T \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)\}$ is a subset of the basis of W^λ . So $x = 0$, which contradicts the choice of x . Hence I is non-zero. This proves (i).

Next we show (ii). Clearly, $I_1(M_1 \otimes \mathcal{S}) \subset I_2(M_2 \otimes \mathcal{S})$ so it suffices to see that $I_1(M_1 \otimes \mathcal{S}) \neq I_2(M_2 \otimes \mathcal{S})$. By our assumption, there exists a non-zero element $x \in M_2 \setminus M_1$. Consider $x \otimes 1 \in M_2 \otimes \mathcal{S}$ and, by way of contradiction, suppose that $I_2(x \otimes 1) \in I_1(M_1 \otimes \mathcal{S})$. Hence there exists $y_i \in M_1$ and $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$(5.1) \quad (g_\lambda \circ I_2)(x \otimes 1) = (g_\lambda \circ I_1)\left(\sum_i y_i \otimes \varphi_i\right).$$

Since $x, y_i \in Z^{(\lambda, 0)}$, one can write $x = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_T^0$ and $y_i = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_T^0$ with $r_T, r_T^i \in R$. By substituting them into (5.1), we have

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_T = \sum_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_T \varphi_i.$$

Hence, by using the definition of φ_T , we have

$$(5.3) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_{T^\lambda T} - \sum_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i = \psi$$

for some $\psi \in \mathcal{S}^{\vee \lambda}$. Take $\nu \in \Lambda$ with $\alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)$, and multiply φ_ν on the both side of (5.3) from the right, we obtain

$$(5.4) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)} r_T \varphi_{T^\lambda T} - \sum_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu = \psi \varphi_\nu.$$

(Recall that φ_ν is the identity map on M^ν and zero on M^κ with $\nu \neq \kappa \in \Lambda^+$ see 2.5.) Now, by using Lemma 2.3 and (2.3), we see that $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu$ is an R -linear combination of elements of the form φ_{UV} where $U \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda', \lambda)$ and $V \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda', \nu)$ with $\lambda' \in \Lambda^+$. Since $\alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)$, this implies that $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu \in \mathcal{S}^0$. In addition, clearly $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \in \mathcal{S}^0$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)$. Hence, the left side of (5.4) is contained in $\mathcal{S}^0$. On the other hand, since $\psi \in \mathcal{S}^{\vee \lambda}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{\vee \lambda}$ is a two-sided ideal of $\mathcal{S}$, $\psi \varphi_\nu$ is an element in $\mathcal{S}^{\vee \lambda}$. Comparing both sides of (5.4), we have $\psi \varphi_\nu \in \mathcal{S}^0 \cap \mathcal{S}^{\vee \lambda} = \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 1)} \subset \mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)}$. Therefore, we have

$$(5.5) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)} r_T \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \equiv \sum_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu \pmod{\mathcal{S}_0^{\vee(\lambda, 0)}}$$

for any $\nu \in \Lambda$ with $\alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)$. We note that $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu$ with $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu \in \mathcal{S}^0$. Then (5.5) implies that

$$(5.6) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)} r_T \varphi_T^0 = \sum_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu.$$

It follows that

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_T^0 = \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \Lambda \\ \alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu)} r_T \varphi_T^0 = \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \Lambda \\ \alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)}} \sum_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu.$$

Put $\varphi_\Sigma = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda, \alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\lambda)} \varphi_\mu$. Then $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} = \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_\Sigma$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ and, by using Lemma 2.3 again, $\varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu$ is an R -linear combination of elements of the form φ_{UV} where $U \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda', \mu)$ and $V \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda', \nu)$ with $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\nu)$ for various $\lambda' \in \Lambda^+$ and $\mu \in \Lambda$. Therefore $\varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu \in \mathcal{S}^0$. We also know that $\varphi_{T^\lambda T} \in \mathcal{S}^0$ for $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Combining these facts we can compute

$$\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_i \varphi_\nu = \varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T} \varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu = (\varphi_{T^\lambda}^0 \cdot \varphi_{T^\lambda T}) \cdot \varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu = \varphi_T^0 \cdot \varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu.$$

Substituting this into (5.7), we have

$$(5.8) \quad x = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_T^0 = \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \Lambda \\ \alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)}} \sum_i \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_T^i \varphi_T^0 \cdot \varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu = \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \Lambda \\ \alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)}} \sum_i y_i \cdot \varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu.$$

Since $\varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu \in \mathcal{S}^0$ and $y_i \in M_1$ we have $y_i \cdot \varphi_\Sigma \varphi_i \varphi_\nu \in M_1$. Hence $x \in M_1$, a contradiction. Therefore $I_2(x \otimes 1) \notin I_1(M_1 \otimes \mathcal{S})$, and this proves (ii). The Lemma is proved. $\square$

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that R is a field. For every $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, let $\iota : \text{rad} Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \rightarrow Z^{(\lambda, 0)}$ be the inclusion map. Then there exists an $\mathcal{S}$ -submodule N^λ of $L_0^\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0} \mathcal{S}$ such that*

$$(5.9) \quad (L_0^\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0} \mathcal{S}) / N^\lambda \simeq L^\lambda$$

as $\mathcal{S}$ -modules. Moreover, N^λ is the unique maximal submodule of $L_0^\lambda \otimes_{\mathcal{S}^0} \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. By the definition of L_0^λ , for each $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, there exists a short exact sequence of $\mathcal{S}^0$ -modules

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{rad} Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \longrightarrow Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \longrightarrow L_0^\lambda \longrightarrow 0.$$

This sequence induces an exact sequence of right $\mathcal{S}$ -module

$$\text{rad} Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \otimes \mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{I} Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \otimes \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow L_0^\lambda \otimes \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow 0,$$

with $I = \iota \otimes \text{id}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Further, note that $\text{rad} W^\lambda$ is the unique maximal submodule of W^λ and $L^\lambda \neq 0$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. Hence under the isomorphism in Theorem 3.3, there exists an $\mathcal{S}$ -submodule $M \simeq \text{rad} W^\lambda$ of $Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ such that $\text{Im}(I) \subset M \subsetneq Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \otimes \mathcal{S}$. Then we have an isomorphism $f : (Z^{(\lambda, 0)} \otimes \mathcal{S}) / \text{Im}(I) \xrightarrow{\sim} L_0^\lambda \otimes \mathcal{S}$. If we put $N^\lambda =$

$f(M/\text{Im}(I))$, we obtain (5.9). The uniqueness of N^λ follows from the uniqueness of $\text{rad}W^\lambda$ and we are done. $\square$

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that R is a field. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, we regard L^λ as an $\mathcal{S}^0$ -module via the restriction. Then $\mathcal{S}^0$ -module L^λ contains L_0^λ as an irreducible submodule.*

Proof. This Lemma can be proved in a similar way as [SawS, Lemma 6.8]. However, this fact itself is important for later discussions, we give here the proof.

Recall the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (resp. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0$) on W^λ (resp. on $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$) and the injective $\mathcal{S}^0$ -module homomorphism $f_\lambda : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \rightarrow W^\lambda$ in Lemma 3.4. We note that f_λ maps $\text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ into $\text{rad}W^\lambda$. In fact, by (3.2), $\langle \varphi_S, \varphi_T \rangle = \langle \varphi_S^0, \varphi_T^0 \rangle_0$ for any $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. On the other hand, if $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \nu) \setminus \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$, then $\alpha(\mu) \neq \alpha(\nu)$, and so $\mu \neq \nu$. It follows that $\varphi_{T^\lambda S} \varphi_{T^\lambda T} = 0$, and $\langle \varphi_S, \varphi_T \rangle = 0$. Hence $f_\lambda(\text{rad}Z^{(\lambda,0)}) \subset \text{rad}W^\lambda$. Now f_λ induces an $\mathcal{S}^0$ -module homomorphism $L_0^\lambda \rightarrow L^\lambda$, which is clearly non-trivial. Since L_0^λ is an irreducible $\mathcal{S}^0$ -module, L^λ contains an irreducible module isomorphic to L_0^λ . $\square$

We can now state our main result.

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose that R is a field. Then, for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$, we have*

$$[\overline{Z}^\lambda : \overline{L}^\mu] = [Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu] \leq [W^\lambda : L^\mu].$$

Proof. Since the first equality was shown in Theorem 4.15, it is enough to see that $[Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu] \leq [W^\lambda : L^\mu]$. Let

$$0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_{l-1} \subsetneq M_l = Z^{(\lambda,0)}$$

be a composition series of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$, and for $k = 0, \dots, l-1$ assume that $M_{k+1}/M_k \simeq L_0^{\mu_k}$ with some $\mu_k \in \Lambda^+$. Let $\iota_k : M_k \hookrightarrow M_{k+1}$ be the inclusion map and put $I_k = \iota_k \otimes \text{id}_\mathcal{S} : M_k \otimes \mathcal{S} \rightarrow M_{k+1} \otimes \mathcal{S}$. Note that I_k is an $\mathcal{S}$ -module homomorphism. Then we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M_k \rightarrow M_{k+1} \rightarrow L_0^{\mu_k} \rightarrow 0$ of $\mathcal{S}^0$ -modules. Then, we obtain an $\mathcal{S}$ -module exact sequence

$$(5.10) \quad M_k \otimes \mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{I_k} M_{k+1} \otimes \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let $\iota'_k : M_k \hookrightarrow Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ be the inclusion map and put $M_k = (\iota'_k \otimes \text{id}_\mathcal{S})(M_k \otimes \mathcal{S})$. Then by Lemma 5.3 (i), (ii), we have a filtration of $\mathcal{S}$ -module in W^λ

$$0 = \mathcal{M}_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_1 \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_{l-1} \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_l = W^\lambda.$$

We shall compute $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}/\mathcal{M}_k$ for $0 \leq k < l$. Let $f : M_{k+1} \otimes \mathcal{S} \rightarrow (\iota'_{k+1} \otimes \text{id}_\mathcal{S})(M_{k+1} \otimes \mathcal{S})/(\iota'_k \otimes \text{id}_\mathcal{S})(M_k \otimes \mathcal{S}) \simeq \mathcal{M}_{k+1}/\mathcal{M}_k$ be the natural map. Clearly, f is a surjective $\mathcal{S}$ -module homomorphism. Moreover, it is easy to see that $\ker f \supset I_k(M_k \otimes \mathcal{S})$. Hence f induces an $\mathcal{S}$ -module surjective map $\tilde{f} : (M_{k+1} \otimes \mathcal{S})/I_k(M_k \otimes \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{k+1}/\mathcal{M}_k$. Since $\mathcal{M}_k \subsetneq \mathcal{M}_{k+1}$, $\tilde{f}$ is a non-zero map. Note that $(M_{k+1} \otimes \mathcal{S})/I_k(M_k \otimes \mathcal{S}) \simeq L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ by (5.10). Hence, there exists a certain $\mathcal{S}$ -submodule $\mathcal{N}_k$ of $L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ such that $(L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S})/\mathcal{N}_k \simeq \mathcal{M}_{k+1}/\mathcal{M}_k$. However, by Lemma 5.4, there exists a unique maximal submodule N^{μ_k} of $L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S}$ such that $(L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S})/N^{\mu_k} \simeq L^{\mu_k}$. Since $N^{\mu_k} \supset \mathcal{N}_k$, we have

a surjective map

$$\mathcal{M}_{k+1}/\mathcal{M}_k \simeq (L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S})/\mathcal{N}_k \rightarrow (L_0^{\mu_k} \otimes \mathcal{S})/N^{\mu_k} \simeq L^{\mu_k}.$$

This proves that $[Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu] \leq [W^\lambda : L^\mu]$. $\square$

In the following special case, we have a more precise formula.

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose that R is a field. Then, for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$ with $\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$,*

$$[\overline{Z}^\lambda : \overline{L}^\mu] = [Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu] = [W^\lambda : L^\mu].$$

Proof. Assume that $\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$. In view of Theorem 5.6, it is enough to show that $[W^\lambda : L^\mu] \leq [Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu]$. Take $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and let

$$0 = W_0 \subsetneq W_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq W_c = W^\lambda$$

be a composition series of W^λ and assume that $W_{i+1}/W_i \simeq L^{\mu_i}$. We regard W_i, L^{μ_i} as $\mathcal{S}^0$ -modules, via the restriction. By Lemma 5.5, there exists a submodule W'_i of W_{i+1} containing W_i such that $W'_i/W_i \simeq L_0^{\mu_i}$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.7, $L_0^\mu \neq 0$ for all $\mu \in \Lambda^+$. Therefore, $W_i \subsetneq W'_i \subset W_{i+1}$. Recall the injective $\mathcal{S}^0$ -module map $f_\lambda : Z^{(\lambda,0)} \rightarrow W^\lambda$ given in Lemma 3.4 and put $M_i = f_\lambda(Z^{(\lambda,0)}) \cap W_i$, $M'_i = f_\lambda(Z^{(\lambda,0)}) \cap W'_i$. Then we obtain a filtration of $\mathcal{S}^0$ -modules

$$0 = M_0 \subset M'_0 \subset M_1 \subset M'_1 \subset \cdots \subset M_{c-1} \subset M'_{c-1} \subset M_c = f_\lambda(Z^{(\lambda,0)})$$

of $f_\lambda(Z^{(\lambda,0)})$. Since f_λ is an injection from $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ to W^λ , we can regard the above filtration as a filtration of $Z^{(\lambda,0)}$. We claim that

$$(5.11) \quad M_i \neq M'_i \text{ if } \alpha(\mu_i) = \alpha(\lambda).$$

We show (5.11). Assume that $\alpha(\mu_i) = \alpha(\lambda)$. Note that, as in the proof of Proposition 3.7, $\varphi_{T^{\mu_i}}^0 + \text{rad}Z^{(\mu_i,0)}$ is a non-zero element of $L_0^{\mu_i}$. Then, there exists $x_{\mu_i} \in W'_i/W_i$ corresponding to $\varphi_{T^{\mu_i}}^0 + \text{rad}Z^{(\mu_i,0)}$. Take a representative $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i} \in W'_i \setminus W_i$ of x_{μ_i} . Take $\varphi_{\mu_i} \in \mathcal{S}^0$ (cf. (2.3)). Since $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i} \in W'_i$ and W'_i is an $\mathcal{S}^0$ -submodule of W^λ , we have $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i}\varphi_{\mu_i} \in W'_i$. Moreover, $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i}\varphi_{\mu_i}$ corresponds to

$$(\varphi_{T^{\mu_i}}^0 + \text{rad}Z^{(\mu_i,0)}) \cdot \varphi_{\mu_i} = \varphi_{T^{\mu_i}}^0 + \text{rad}Z^{(\mu_i,0)} \neq 0$$

Therefore, $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i}\varphi_{\mu_i} \in W'_i \setminus W_i$. On the other hand, since $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i} \in W_{i+1} \subset W^\lambda$, we can write $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i} = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda)} r_T \varphi_T$ ($r_T \in R$) and hence $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i}\varphi_{\mu_i} = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_i)} r_T \varphi_T$ since φ_{μ_i} is an identity map on M^{μ_i} and is zero otherwise. By noticing $\alpha(\mu_i) = \alpha(\lambda)$, we define an element $y_{\mu_i} \in Z^{(\lambda,0)}$ by $y_{\mu_i} = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_i)} r_T \varphi_T^0$. Then we have $f_\lambda(y_{\mu_i}) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu_i)} r_T \varphi_T = \tilde{x}_{\mu_i}\varphi_{\mu_i}$. It follows that $\tilde{x}_{\mu_i}\varphi_{\mu_i} \in \{f_\lambda(Z^{(\lambda,0)}) \cap W'_i\} \setminus \{f_\lambda(Z^{(\lambda,0)}) \cap W_i\}$. Therefore, $M_i \neq M'_i$ and (5.11) holds.

By the claim (5.11), the quotient M'_i/M_i is a non-zero $\mathcal{S}^0$ -submodule of $L_0^{\mu_i}$. Hence $M'_i/M_i \simeq L_0^{\mu_i}$. This proves that $[W^\lambda : L^\mu] \leq [Z^{(\lambda,0)} : L_0^\mu]$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+$ such that $\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$. The theorem is proved. $\square$

5.8. We return to the setting in 4.1. Let $\Lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$ under the condition (4.1) and (4.3). For an r -partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$, we denote by $\mathcal{S}_b^{\vee\lambda}$ the R -submodule of $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ spanned by φ_{ST}^b such that $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\alpha)$ with $\alpha \triangleright \lambda$. Moreover, for an r -partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$, $T^\lambda \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \lambda)$, and in fact T^λ is the unique semistandard λ -Tableau of type λ . Moreover, $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}^\lambda$ is the unique element in $\text{Std}(\lambda)$ such that $\lambda(\mathbf{t}) = T^\lambda$. Thus, $m_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}^b = m_{\mathbf{t}^\lambda \mathbf{t}^\lambda}^b = m_\lambda^b$, and $\varphi_\lambda^b = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}^b$ is the identity map on M_λ^b . We define the Weyl module W_b^λ as the right $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ -submodule of $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)/\mathcal{S}_b^{\vee\lambda}$ spanned by the image of φ_λ^b . For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$, we denote by φ_T^b the image of $\varphi_{T^\lambda T}^b$ in $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)/\mathcal{S}_b^{\vee\lambda}$. Then we know that the Weyl module W_b^λ is R -free with basis $\{\varphi_T^b \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)\}$. The Weyl module W_b^λ enjoys an associative symmetric bilinear form, defined by the equation

$$\varphi_{T^\lambda S}^b \varphi_{TT^\lambda}^b \equiv \langle \varphi_S^b, \varphi_T^b \rangle_b \cdot \varphi_\lambda^b \pmod{\mathcal{S}_b^{\vee\lambda}}$$

for all $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$. Let $L_b^\lambda = W_b^\lambda / \text{rad} W_b^\lambda$, where $\text{rad} W_b^\lambda = \{x \in W_b^\lambda \mid \langle x, y \rangle_b = 0 \text{ for all } y \in W_b^\lambda\}$. By [SawS, Proposition 5.11], we know that, for all r -partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$, L_b^λ is an absolutely irreducible and $\{L_b^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}\}$ is a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ -modules. Furthermore, for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$, we denote by $[W_b^\lambda : L_b^\mu]$ the composition multiplicity of L_b^μ in W_b^λ .

Note that the above definition of the Weyl module W_b^λ coincides with the definition of the Weyl module $\bar{Z}^\lambda$ when $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}^{\bar{0}}(\Lambda)$ under the isomorphism b in Proposition 4.9. Consequently, under the isomorphism b , we have $[W_b^\lambda : L_b^\mu] = [\bar{Z}^\lambda : \bar{L}^\mu]$ for every $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$.

On the other hand, note that in the case where $r = 1$, the notation for $\mathcal{S}^b(\mathbf{m}, n)$ coincides with the standard notation for q -Schur algebras discussed as in [M1, Chapter 4]. So, we use freely such a notation. For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$, we denote by $[W^{\lambda^{(i)}} : L^{\mu^{(i)}}]$ ($1 \leq i \leq r$) is defined as the composition multiplicity of $L^{\mu^{(i)}}$ in $W^{\mu^{(i)}}$ for $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)})$ and $\mu = (\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(r)})$.

Proposition 5.9 ([SawS, Proposition 5.14]). *Let $\Lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$. Suppose that R is a field, and that (4.1) and (4.3) are satisfied. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$. Then under the isomorphism in Theorem 4.5, we have*

$$[W^\lambda : L^\mu] = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^r [W^{\lambda^{(i)}} : L^{\mu^{(i)}}] & \text{if } \alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, combining Theorem 5.7 and Proposition 4.9 and Proposition 5.9, we have the following.

Corollary 5.10. *Let $\Lambda = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{n,r}$. Suppose that R is a field, and that (4.1) and (4.3) are satisfied. Then, for all $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{n,r}$ with $\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$, we have*

$$[W^\lambda : L^\mu] = \prod_{i=1}^r [W^{\lambda^{(i)}} : L^{\mu^{(i)}}].$$

REFERENCES

- [A] S. Ariki; Cyclotomic q -Schur algebras as quotients of quantum algebras, J. Reine Angew. Math. **513** (1999), 53 - 69.
- [AK] S. Ariki and K. Koike; A Hecke algebra of $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z}) \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$ and construction of its irreducible representations, Adv. Math. **106** (1994), no. 2, 216 - 243.
- [CPS] E. Cline, B. Parshall, and L. Scott; Integral and graded quasi-hereditary algebras, I, J. Algebra **131** (1990), 126 - 160.
- [DJ] R. Dipper and G. James; The q -Schur algebra, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **59** (1989), 23 - 50.
- [DJMa] R. Dipper, G. James, and A. Mathas; Cyclotomic q -Schur algebras, Math. Z. **229** (1999), 385 - 416.
- [DJMu] R. Dipper, G. James, and E. Murphy; Hecke algebras of type B_n at roots of unity, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **70** (1995), no. 3, 505 - 528.
- [DM] R. Dipper and A. Mathas; Morita equivalences of Ariki-Koike algebras, Math. Z., **240** (2002), 579 - 610.
- [DR1] J. Du and H. Rui; Borel Type Subalgebras of the q -Schur^m Algebra, J. Algebra **213** (1999), 567 - 595.
- [DR2] J. Du and H. Rui; Based algebras and standard basis for quasi-hereditary algebras, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **350** (1998), 3207 - 3235.
- [GL] J. J. Graham and G. I. Lehrer; Cellular algebras, Invent. Math. **123** (1996), no. 1, 1 - 34.
- [H] Hu, J; Schur-Weyl reciprocity between quantum groups and Hecke algebras of type $G(r, 1, n)$, Math. Z. **238** (2001), 505 - 521.
- [JM] G. D. James, and A. Mathas; The Jantzen sum formula for cyclotomic q -Schur algebras, Trans. A.M.S. **352** (2000), 5381 - 5404.
- [LT] B. Leclerc and J.-Y. Thibon; Canonical bases of q -deformed Fock spaces, Internet. Math. Res. Notices, **1996**, 447 - 498.
- [M1] A. Mathas; Iwahori-Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [M2] A. Mathas; Tilting modules for cyclotomic Schur algebras, J. Reine Angew. Math. **562** (2003), 137 - 169.
- [S] T. Shoji; A Frobenius formula for the characters of Ariki-Koike algebras, J. Algebra **226** (2000), no. 2, 818 - 856.
- [SakS] M. Sakamoto and T. Shoji; Schur-Weyl reciprocity for Ariki-Koike algebras, J. Algebra **221** (1999), no. 1, 293 - 314.
- [SawS] N. Sawada and T. Shoji; Modified Ariki-Koike algebras and cyclotomic q -Schur algebras, Math. Z. **249** (2005), 829 - 867.
- [U] D. Ugolov; Canonical bases of higher-level q -deformed Fock spaces and Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials, in "Physical Combinatorics", ed. M. Kashiwara, T. Miwa, Progress in Math, **191** (2000).
- [VV] M. Varagnolo and E. Vasserot; On the decomposition matrices of the quantized Schur algebra, Duke Math. J. **100** (1999), 267 - 297.
- [Y] X. Yvonne; A conjecture for q -decomposition matrices of cyclotomic v -Schur algebras, preprint arXiv:math.RT/0505379.